ENGLISH CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY

THE THREE CREEDS OF THE CHURCH

REV. CHARLES KNAPP, D.D.

Class 238.1Q Book K727
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/threecreedsofchu0000ckna

THE THREE CREEDS OF THE CHURCH.

The English Churchman's Library.

Cloth, with Gilt Top and marker, 1s. net. Leather, 2s. net.

The Mysteries of Grace
by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.

Letters to a Godson *(First Series)*
by the Rev. M. Cyril Bickersteth, M.A.

Letters to a Godson *(Second Series)*
By the Rev M. Cyril Bickersteth, M.A.

First Studies in S. Mark
by G. M. Ireland Blackburne

Spiritual Counsels to District Visitors and Others
by the late G. H. Wilkinson, D.D., Bishop of S. Andrews: Primus

The Christian use of the Psalter
by the Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A.

Our Working Girls and how to help them
by Flora L. Freeman

The Practical Religion
by the Very Rev. Provost Staley

Consciousness of God
by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.

The Work and Influence of the Holy Spirit
by the Rev. the Hon. C. J. Littleton, M.A.

The Book of Common Prayer
by the Rev. Canon Newbolt, M.A.

The Atonement
by the Rev. J. A. V. Magee, M.A.

The Three Creeds of the Church
by the Rev. C. Knapp, D.D.

Other Volumes in preparation.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. Ltd.
London: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
Oxford: 9 High Street

The English Churchman's Library

THE THREE CREEDS OF THE CHURCH

BY

THE REV. C. KNAPP, D.D.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD

GOLDEN GATE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
SAN FRANCISCO

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., LTD.
LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
OXFORD: 9 High Street

238.1 Q
K727

64417

First printed, 1909

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

NOTE.

This little volume is not written primarily for the student ; the object has been to give such an account of the growth and use of our creeds as will interest and inform the intelligent reader. Both the limits of the book and its object, therefore, naturally preclude a very full and minute dealing with the subject.

SYNOPSIS.

PAGE.

Introduction.

Diversity of form a sign of life

I Comparison of the Three Creeds 1-8

Form.—Apostles' and Nicene: an expansion of Baptismal formula.
Athanasian: A Canticle.
Use.—Apostles': Baptismal Creed of the West.
Nicene: Conciliar Creed of the East.
The Creed of the Altar.
Athanasian: Creed of the Clergy and of the West.
Use in the English Church.
Authority.—Apostles', based on Western usage.
Nicene on Œcumenical Council and usage of East and West.
Athanasian on later Western usage.

II Creeds and Apostolic Teaching 9-16

i. One common type of Apostolic Teaching.
ii. Credal and Liturgical formulæ in the New Testament.
iii. The requirement of a public Confession at Baptism.

III Creeds in the Second Century 17-22

i. Sub-Apostolic Fathers preserved the common type of teaching.
(Clemens Romanus: Ignatius of Antioch.)

PAGE.

ii. Justin Martyr.
(Connection between credal forms and Baptism.)

iii. Irenæus: The type of Eastern teaching.

iv. Tertullian: The Creeds of Rome and Carthage.

IV APOSTLES' CREED . . 23-36

i. RUFINUS: a convenient starting point.
The Creed of Aquileia and Rome.

ii. OLD ROMAN CREED.
(*a*) Texts of Rufinus and Marcellus.
(*b*) Its earliest use about A.D. 160.

iii. EXPANSION OF THE CREED.
(*a*) The "Added" Clauses.
(*b*) The Creeds which first had them.
Fides Hieronymi.
Creed of Niceta.
(*c*) The writers who first used them.
APPENDIX: Text of the Fides Hieronymi.

V MODERN CRITICISM AND THE CREED 37-48

A Threefold Charge.—Departure from Primitive Teaching.—Later Interpretations.—Unauthorised Clauses.

CREED AND PRIMITIVE TEACHING.
(*a*) The Creed not Unitarian.
(*b*) The Personality of the Spirit.
(*c*) The Virgin Birth—
Evidence of S. Matthew and S. Luke—
Silence of S. Paul, the Acts and the Catholic Epistles.
(*d*) The term "Catholic":
No change of meaning, but a secondary meaning added.

PAGE.

VI NICENE CREED . . 49-60

i. ARIANISM leads to the Council of Nicea.

ii. THE COUNCIL: The symbol of Eusebius of Cæsarea and the additions made by the Council.

iii. THE CREED AFTER NICEA.
Influenced by the heresies of:
(*a*) Marcellus of Ancyra on the Eternal Sonship.
(*b*) Apollinaris concerning the Humanity.
(*c*) Macedonius concerning the Holy Spirit.
(*d*) Creed of Epiphanius:
i. Divergence from Nicene Symbol.
ii. Disputed Origin.
iii. Sanctioned at Chalcedon (?) and Contantinople.

iv. DIVERGENT USE OF EAST AND WEST.
(*a*) The Creed used first at the Altar.
(*b*) Western Use.—The Council of Toledo and the "Filioque" Clause.
(*c*) Contention between East and West.

VII ATHANASIAN CREED . . 61-75

i. GALLICAN ORIGIN.—Date between 420-450. (Bishop Gibson's "Evidence.")

ii. OBJECTIONS TO ITS USE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.
(*a*) Condemnatory Clauses:—
i. Disputed Meaning.
ii. Their meaning is interpreted by Convocation.
(*b*) Expediency of the use of the Creed in the Public Offices.

iii. STAGES OF THE CONTROVERSY.
(*a*) Creed and the Puritans.
(*b*) At the Revolution.
(*c*) In the Eighteenth Century.
(*d*) In the Nineteenth Century.
(*e*) Present Position.

PAGE.

VIII DOCTRINE OF THE CREEDS . 76-102

(*a*) Doctrine of the nature of God.
(*b*) Doctrine of God's relations with the world and man.

i. NATURE OF GOD.
(*a*) His Unity.
(*b*) His Personality (Transcendence and Immanence).
(*c*) Trinity in Unity.
Difficulty of terms in Greek, Latin and English.
(*d*) Doctrine of the Son.
The Incarnation and subsequent Heresies.
(*e*) Doctrine of the Spirit.
His Personality—the phrase "proceeding."

ii. GOD'S RELATION TO THE WORLD.
(*a*) FATHER: Creator.
(Yet all three Persons share in the work.)
(*b*) SON AS REDEEMER.
i. S. Athanasius on the motive of redemption.
ii. Method: Through an Incarnation.
iii. THE ATONEMENT.
Scriptural view of the redeeming work.—The Death and the Risen Life inseparable.
iv. ASCENSION AND HEAVENLY HIGH PRIESTHOOD.
v. THE SECOND COMING.
(*c*) SPIRIT AS SANCTIFIER.
The work of the Spirit in the Church.
(*a*) The Church.—Her Marks—One Holy—Catholic—Apostolic.

PAGE.

(*b*) The Threefold Ministry.
(*c*) Communion of Saints.
(*d*) Forgiveness of Sins.
(*e*) The Christian's Goal: The Life Everlasting.

APPENDIX 103

The Relation between the Creeds of the East and the West.

GLOSSARY 109

INTRODUCTION.

Those who enter upon the study of a religion that has lived through nineteen centuries, and has met the needs and aspirations of many races of different climes and temperaments, must be prepared to find it not always easy to trace the exact growth of its institutions and its formularies. Growth and change are the evidences of life as much in religion as in nature. Uniformity and fixity are synonymous with death and stagnation. As we trace the history of our creeds we shall find this wonderfully exemplified; the formularies of the West are not always the formularies of the East—because the needs of East and West are not the same; but through all the variety of expression and use we shall find the same faith once delivered to the saints preserved for us. Herein lies the Church's catholicity. She is universal in that having one faith expressing itself in different forms she meets the need of all men. So through her infinite variety she preserves her unity. It is, perhaps, the greatest lesson we have to learn from the history of the past—a lesson deeply needed today, in which too often, on the one hand, the

Church's catholicity is but another term for a death-dealing and unchanging sameness, and on the other, any change or addition is made the subject of an attack on her fidelity to her earliest teaching.

The truth—the one and only truth—may find its expression in one form to the Greek, in another to the Roman; in one form in early centuries, in another in the Middle Ages; in one form to the Teuton, in another to the Japanese, because it is a living truth, not "of the letter that killeth, but the Spirit which giveth life." It was so in the past, it will be so, nay, it is so, to-day. The Spirit of God has expressed Himself in many forms, both within and without our own Church in England—the individualism of the Evangelical, the Socialism of the Broad Church, the ritual of the High Churchman, each is an expression of a diversity of working and of gifts, and this diversity is the key to much that otherwise would be perplexing in the life of the Church in the earlier ages.

I.

A COMPARISON OF THE THREE CREEDS.

The three creeds which stand within our Prayer Book are diverse both in (1) form; (2) use, and (3) authority.

(1) IN FORM.

The Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed are modelled on the baptismal formula of which they are an expansion. Neither as it now stands is exactly the same as the original from which it came, nor can the name of either be taken as literally true. The "Apostles'" Creed is the creed based on the common type of Apostolic teaching. The "Nicene" Creed is not the creed of Nicea, but a somewhat fuller and kindred statement coming to us with the sanction of one, if not two, Œcumenical Councils.

The Athanasian Creed is not a creed in the sense in which the other two are. Its original title was *Fides Catholica*, and it was often spoken of as a sermon or instruction. It was also known as a "hymn," and in the early

days of its use was printed with the Psalter and Canticles. The term, *Symbolum*, or creed, was not applied to it till the end of the ninth century. The name *Fides Athanasii* is also apt to mislead; it is not the work of Athanasius; it more closely resembles the teaching of S. Augustine than S. Athanasius, and its author is unknown.

(2) USE.

The Apostles' Creed.

The Apostles' Creed is the great baptismal creed of the *Western* Church, and even to this day is unknown in the Eastern Church. Its earliest form is found in the Church at Rome as early as A.D. 165, thence it passed to the Churches of the West (viz. Africa, Gaul, and Spain). Many forms of it, varying more or less from one another, are found during the early centuries, and it reached its present form in the Church of Gaul, about the middle of the eighth century.

The Church at Rome kept to the earliest and simplest form until the latter part of the fifth century, when she abandoned it as her baptismal formula for about two centuries, using the Nicene Creed in place of it as being a better safeguard against Arian teaching.

It was restored to its place again in the eighth century, not however in the old form, but in the expanded form in use in the Frankish

Church, probably owing to the influence of Charlemagne.

In the English Church to-day the Apostles' Creed is used in the daily offices of Matins and Evensong; in an interrogatory form in the Sacrament of Baptism and the Visitation of the Sick, and in the Church Catechism for the instruction of children. Thus the creed is especially the creed of the laity, and it has always been so; from the days of the Venerable Bede onwards we find it coupled with the Lord's Prayer as essential for the layman. One of the canons of Edgar's reign ran as follows :—"That every man learn to be expert at *Pater Noster et Credo* as he desires to lie in holy ground, or to be esteemed worthy of Housel; for he who refuseth to learn that is not a good Christian, and he cannot of right undertake for others at Baptism, nor at the bishop's hands."

It was used in the services of the Hours from the ninth century onwards, perhaps a century earlier at Prime, and at the Reformation passed from these to our Matins and Evensong. The book of instruction for the laity in use in the Middle Ages, called the Primer, invariably contained it, and a metrical version was placed in the "Lay Folks' Mass Book," which they could recite while the priest said the Nicene symbol.

It does not always appear in the same

form, and even to-day a relic of the diversity in its form is seen if we compare the creed in the Visitation and Baptismal Office with that in Matins and the Catechism.

It is probable that the English Church until the ninth century, or later, used the earliest known form of it, the Old Roman Creed, which Augustine would have brought with him to Canterbury. It is found in Greek in a ninth century Psalter, known as the Psalter of Æthelstan, written by an Anglo-Saxon (see frontispiece), and in the Bodleian Library is the famous *Codex Laudianus* (Codex E of the Acts of the Apostles), which contains a Latin text of the creed, and was in the possession of the Venerable Bede. (See plate facing page 23.)

The earliest use of the creed is inseparable from Baptism. It is connected with the training of the catechumen; the convert was required to commit it to memory beforehand, and at the baptismal ceremony to repeat and endorse it publicly. The giving of the creed to the catechumen and the public recitation of it were known as the *traditio* (the delivery) and the *reddítio* (giving back) *symboli* (of the creed).

The Nicene Creed.

In both East and West this creed stands to-day in the service of the Altar. But this was not its original use. Like the Apostles', it was a baptismal creed, and when Eusebius

of Cæsarea presented his creed to the Council of Nicea, he stated it to be the baptismal creed of his own Church.[1] It is still the baptismal creed of the East. How it gained its position in the Eucharistic Service, we shall see later.

The creed we use is not the actual creed of Nicea, but one closely related to it. The Nicene symbol was considerably shorter, and ended with the words "And in the Holy Ghost." Its use was at first confined to the East, it passed into the Western Churches in the fifth century.

The early history of the creeds in the Eastern Church is far more complicated than in the West, although from the second century onwards we can trace a common type of teaching. We have no definite evidence of a common baptismal confession occupying the place which the Apostles' Creed did in the Western Church until the fourth century. The Eastern baptismal confessions show a much greater diversity in form and expression; whereas the creeds of the West are all clearly allied to the Old Roman Creed.

The Athanasian Creed.

Of late and Gallican origin, this was an exposition of doctrine for the clergy; later on it came to be used in the devotions of the Church, and is found in the Psalters of the eighth century.

[1] For a discussion of the point, see p. 51.

In A.D. 922, is was used in the Church of S. Martin of Tours, in the service of Prime and Evensong, when it was sung by the brethren, and from the offices of the religious it passed to the public services of the Church.

In England, before the Reformation, it was recited daily at Prime, and there are traces of attempts to familiarise the laity with the creed by metrical versions in the vernacular.

At the Reformation it was placed in several of the Primers of Henry VIII's reign, and in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, it was ordered to be said at Matins upon the six Great Festivals, viz., "Christmas, the Epiphany, Easter, the Ascension, Pentecost, and upon Trinity Sunday."

The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI added seven Saints' days to insure the public recital of the creed once a month. Until 1662 it was said or sung on these occasions in addition to the Apostles' Creed. But at the revision in 1662 it was ordered to take the place of the shorter form.

In the Roman Church it is ordered to be recited on Sundays only, at Prime, thus the English Church alone has made it a popular creed.

Although several Greek versions of it are extant, dating back as far as the fourteenth century, yet the creed found no official place in the Greek Church until late in the eighteenth

century, when it was put in the office book of the Church, the *Horologion*.

At the Reformation most of the Continental Churches discontinued its use in the public services, although some of the Continental confessions of faith state their adherence to its doctrine.

It has never found a place in the Prayer Book of the American Church; the Church of Ireland retains it in her Prayer Book without the rubric ordering its public use, but in the preface of her Prayer Book she says:—"With reference to the Athanasian Creed (commonly so called) we have removed the rubric directing its use on certain days; but in so doing, this Church has not withdrawn its witness, as expressed in the Articles of Religion, and here again renewed, to the truth of the Articles of the Christian Faith therein contained."

(3) AUTHORITY.

The Apostles' Creed came to us sanctioned by the usage of the *Western* Church, from the last half of the second century; it is the creed of no Council nor of any great controversy.

The Nicene Creed, on the other hand, was first the creed of the East. It passed into use in the Churches of the West towards the end of the fifth century, and comes to us with the sanction of many centuries of both Latin and Eastern usage, and also with the express sanc-

tion of the Council of Chalcedon (excepting the "Filioque" clause).

The Creed of S. Athanasius stands on an entirely different level. It has neither the antiquity nor the widespread usage of the other creeds. Dating, at the earliest, from about A.D. 420, it is of unknown authorship, and without support of any œcumenical council. It might almost be called the creed of the Middle Ages, since it is from the ninth century and onwards that we find it in more or less general use in the West. In the East it was not used at all publicly till the eighteenth century.

The Church of England bases her use of the three creeds on their agreement with Holy Scripture. The eighth article states that they "ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

II.

THE CREEDS AND THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING.

The early days of a religious movement are not days for the refinements of organisation or for the elaboration of forms of dogma, of ritual, or of ceremonial; they are days of evangelisation. Like a pioneer on a virgin soil, the work of the evangelist is to cut down and destroy before he can plant and build up. It is a day of proselytising and of converting, of weaning men from old paths and beliefs and bringing them to embrace the new. It is for the generations that follow the pioneers to parcel out the land, to organise, to regulate and to control. Therefore, whatever ritual, ceremonial or organisation is found at the beginning of a movement it will generally be on the simplest lines, such as is sufficient to meet the needs of the hour; but as the religious community gets settled, the need for more precise statement of principles, and for more exact forms and ritual will be felt, and as it is felt it will be supplied.

Thus was it in the Apostolic times; it was

a day of pulling down and rooting up, a day of upheaval, when the prejudice of the Jew and the idolatrous practices of the Greek must first be destroyed before the new faith could have room to take root and develop. So it is that the Apostolic writings deal chiefly with questions arising either from Jewish traditions or the difficulties of Gentile life: the Epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews combat the prejudice of the Jew; the Epistles to the Corinthians, the idolatrous practices of the Gentile.

There is little or no place for the discussion of forms and ceremonies. Yet that there must have been from the earliest days some more or less settled method for the instruction of the catechumens, and the administration of Baptism and of the Holy Eucharist would seem certain. The forms of Baptism and the Eucharist would keep to the actual words given by the Divine Master, and it would seem natural that the instruction of the catechumen should follow close upon the same lines. The earliest instruction on the administration of Holy Baptism is found in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (a Jewish-Christian work generally accepted as belonging to the first century), and runs as follows:—"And concerning Baptism, baptize after this manner: Having first recited all these precepts baptize into the name of the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in living water, but if thou hast not living water,

baptize into other water, and if thou canst not in cold water, then baptize in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour out water upon the head thrice into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." This clearly shows that the Church in the earliest days was following exactly the formula given by our Lord in S. Matt. xxviii. 19.

Yet there are some indications within the New Testament itself that there already existed a form of teaching or of "sound doctrine" communicated to the faithful, a general agreement in the manner of setting forth the faith in Jesus, and perhaps some settled liturgical forms.

THE COMMON TYPE OF TEACHING.

A brief examination of the Apostolic speeches in the Acts of the Apostles shows a manifest agreement in the manner in which S. Peter and S. Paul presented to the Jews and to the Gentiles their teaching concerning Jesus. We have within the first ten chapters five speeches of S. Peter, all of which follow the same line of thought (Acts ii. 14-40; iii. 12-26; iv. 8-12; v. 29-32; x. 34-43).

Put briefly they deal with the Messiahship of Jesus, His betrayal, crucifixion, death, resurrection, ascension, the consequent remission of sins, the judgment to come, and the gift of the Holy Ghost.

When we turn to S. Paul's speech to the

Jews in the synagogue at Antioch, in Pisidia (chapter xiii. 16-41), we find exactly the same points emphasised, and again in his defence before Felix and before Agrippa (chapter xxiv. 14, 15; xxvi. 6-9, 19-23); and to the Jews at Rome (chapter xxviii. 23) he emphasises the resurrection and the Messiahship of Jesus.

In preaching to an entirely Gentile audience we should expect a considerable change, since, with the Jews, the Apostles shared a common belief in God the Father and Maker of the world, and held with them also the hope of the Messiah and the Old Testament writings. They had not this common ground with the Greek. We find, therefore, that the teaching of one God the Creator of the universe stands first, followed afterwards by the story of the death and resurrection of Jesus and of judgment to come (Acts xiv. 15-17; xvii. 23-31).

This similarity of teaching appears to be more than accidental, it points to some agreement among the Apostles as to the manner of presenting the Christian Faith.

THE INSTRUCTION OF THE CATECHUMEN.

The instruction of those who were converted to the new faith met from the first with careful attention. We have an early instance of this in the case of Apollos (Acts xviii. 24-26) who "had been instructed in the way of the Lord" and "to whom Aquila and Priscilla

expounded the way of the Lord more perfectly." Just as on the mission field to-day, the preparation of the catechumen formed then a most important feature of the Church's work.

Such instruction would be given by word of mouth, but it must have soon taken some settled form, whether written or unwritten, and there are clear evidences of this in S. Paul's Epistles. He writes to Christians at Rome, "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto you were delivered" (Rom. vi. 17, R.V.). In the Galatians he speaks of it as "this rule" (vi. 16); in the First Epistle to Timothy he twice alludes to it, first as "the good confession" which Timothy had publicly made, and later as a "deposit" (marg.) which he had committed to Timothy's charge (vi. 12, 20, R.V.), and once more in 2 Tim. iv. 7 he calls it the "faith."

LITURGICAL FORMS.

There are also traces in the Epistles of certain liturgical forms in use in the Apostolic times. Whether these were taken from Christian hymns or credal forms we cannot say, but they bear an evident likeness to the summaries of the Faith which we call creeds. The most important are the following :—

(*a*) "To us there is one God, the Father, of Whom are all things, and we unto Him ; and

one Lord, Jesus Christ, through Whom are all things and we through Him" (1 Cor. viii. 6, R.V.).

(*b*) "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that

Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures;

And that He was buried;

And that He hath been raised the third day according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, R.V.).

(*c*) "He Who was manifested in the flesh,

Justified in the spirit,

Seen of angels,

Preached among the nations,

Believed on in the world,

Received up into glory" (1 Tim. iii. 16, R.V.).

We may assume, then, that from the first necessity compelled a more or less common type of instruction for the catechumen containing the important facts of our Lord's life, and moulded on the model of the baptismal formula.

A PUBLIC CONFESSION OF FAITH.

Further, it is also clear that from the earliest times those who offered themselves for Baptism were required to make a public confession of their faith. (See Acts viii. 37, R.V. margin; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13.)

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, for us

to form any idea of what the acceptance of Christianity then meant. To a Jew it meant a public parting with the old ways, and a clear affirmation that the rejected Teacher of Nazareth was the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed; to the heathen it meant even more, it involved the utter rejection of the religion and sacred rites of his nation and the gods of his fathers, and the public abjuration of idols, the public confession of one God, the Father, and that the Man Jesus was His Son, and the Redeemer of the world from sin.

At the time of initiation, therefore, the new disciple was called upon to declare to the world his new belief. "With the heart," says S. Paul, "man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (See Rom. x. 10.)

There was in those days no divorce between the belief of the heart and the confession of the lips; and the public confession was the guarantee of the heart's faith. [1]

[1] Those who desire to compare more fully the Apostles' Creed with the teaching in the Acts will find it excellently done in Rackham's "Acts of the Apostles," Introduction (p. lxx–lxxi). The student might compare with this Plummer's "S. Luke," Introduction (p. v).

III.

THE CREEDS IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

In the New Testament we have found (1) a common agreement in the manner of presenting the faith in Jesus; (2) distinct indications that this teaching formed the basis for the instruction of the convert, and that he was required at Baptism to declare his assent to it; (3) that although the exact form of this confession has not been preserved, yet there are embedded in the Pauline Epistles certain brief summaries of the truth closely corresponding to the creeds.

THE SUB-APOSTOLIC PERIOD.

When we pass to the literature of the sub-Apostolic period, we have the clearest indications of the nature of this summary of faith, although we still cannot find the actual words of the baptismal confession.

Clemens Romanus (A.D. 95) gives us two brief summaries of the Faith.

(*a*) "Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace which was poured out upon us?"[1]

(*b*) Or again

1 Clements' "Genuine Epistle to the Corinthians," Ch. 46

"As God lives and the Lord Jesus Christ lives and the Holy Spirit, the faith and hope of the elect" (chapter lviii. 2).

Ignatius of Antioch (A.D. 110) three times in his epistles presents us with summaries closely resembling our Apostles' Creed, so far as it concerns our Lord. One of these, from the Epistle to the Trallians (chapter ix.) will suffice.

"Be ye deaf, therefore, when any man speaketh to you apart from Jesus Christ Who was of the race of David, Who was the Son of Mary, Who was truly born, and ate and drank; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died, in the sight of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the earth; Who, moreover, was truly raised from the dead, His Father having raised Him, Who in like fashion will so raise us also who believe in Him—His Father I say, will raise us in Christ Jesus, apart from Whom we have no true life."

Whether or not some form like our Apostles' Creed was in use in the Church at Antioch in the days of Ignatius we need not consider. What we are justified in noting is that the same facts which form the body of our creed to-day are emphasised by Ignatius, and that these were the same as were emphasised by S. Peter and S. Paul in the Acts. The common type of Apostolic teaching has passed unchanged to the sub-Apostolic Church.

Our next witness is Justin Martyr, of Ephesus. He was a native of Palestine, and converted to Christianity in manhood; he taught at Ephesus, and was martyred at Rome about A.D. 165. Although his summaries are not nearly so full as that of Ignatius, yet he uses phrases bearing a distinct similarity to the creeds and connects them closely with Baptism.

Five times in his "Apology for Christianity," and twice in his "Dialogue with Trypho," he seems to be quoting from some credal form.

Two instances from the Apology, and one from the Dialogue may be given.

(1) "For in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the Universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit they then receive the washing with water" (Ap. i. 61).

(2) "And in the name of Jesus Christ, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and in the name of the Holy Ghost . . . he who is illuminated is washed" (Ap. i. 61).

(3) "For every demon is overcome and subdued when exorcised in the name of this very Son of God, Who is the first born of every creature, Who became man by the Virgin, Who suffered and was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your nation, Who died, Who rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven" (Dialogue 85).

Justin stands at the middle of the century,

just at the point where we pass in the study of the creeds from uncertainty to certainty, from apparent indications of credal forms to the credal forms themselves.

At the close of the century stand two writers whose evidence not only makes the use of the creeds certain, but also shows that there was divergence in form in the East and the West.

THE TESTIMONY OF IRENÆUS.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was more Eastern than Western ; coming from Ephesus to be Bishop of Lyons he brought with him many of the customs of the Church of the East.

There are two passage in his writings worthy of note ; writing against the heretics he says, "Even if the Apostles themselves had not left us any Scriptures, ought we not to follow the course of the traditions which they delivered to those whom they entrusted with the Churches," and he goes on to speak of those who have received the Christian Faith as having salvation written by the Spirit in their hearts without paper and ink, and as believing in "one God, the Framer of heaven and earth, and of all things that are in them by Jesus Christ the Son of God, Who for His exceeding love's sake towards His creature submitted to the birth which was to be of the Virgin, Himself

by Himself uniting man to God; Who suffered also under Pontius Pilate and rises again, and being received in brightness will come in glory as the Saviour of them which are saved, and the Judge of them that are judged, and send into eternal fire them that counterfeit the truth and despise His Father and His coming" (Iren. iv. 3 § 1).

Again, the Church, though dispersed throughout the world, believes "in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and the sea and all things that are in them, and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, Who became incarnate for our salvation, and in the Holy Ghost, Who proclaimed through the prophets and dispensation of God and the advents and the birth from a Virgin and the Passion and the Resurrection from the dead and the Ascension into heaven in the Flesh of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, and in His future manifestation from heaven in the glory of the Father to gather all things in one and to raise up anew all flesh of all the human race" (Iren. i. 10 § 1).

TERTULLIAN'S CREED

Tertullian was a Western; he lived first at Rome and then at Carthage, and he is a witness not only of Western usage, but also of the practical agreement between the use of the Church of Rome and the Church of Carthage, and from his evidence we are able to fix

the form of the creed used in the Churches of Rome and Carthage by the year A.D. 165.

His creed occurs three times in his writings, not in the exact words perhaps, but slightly paraphrased ; two of these are quoted.

The first is from a work called "De Virginibus Velandis," and seems to come nearest to the actual form of the creed.

"The rule of faith indeed is but one altogether and unalterable of believing forsooth
In One God Almighty,
Maker of the world,
And His Son, Jesus Christ,
Born of the Virgin Mary,
Crucified under Pontius Pilate,
The third day raised from the dead,
Received into the heavens,
Sitting now at the right hand of the Father,
About to come to judge the living and the dead
Through the resurrection indeed of the flesh."

The other passage comes from his work against Praxeas, and runs as follows :—

"We believe that there is but one God, but yet with this dispensation or economy, that this one God has His Son, His Word, coming forth from Him ; by Whom all things were made, and without Him was not anything made ; and that He was by the Father sent into the Virgin, and of her born Man and God, Son of man and Son of God, and named Jesus the

Christ. That this is He Who suffered, died and was buried according to the Scriptures, raised again by the Father, and taken up into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick and the dead. Who sent from thence according to His promise from the Father the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the Sanctifier of the Faith of them who believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

A comparison of these extracts from Irenæus and Tertullian will show that whilst the first quotation from Tertullian is like our Apostles' Creed, the latter quotation, and the extracts from Irenæus more closely resemble the Nicene Creed.

The evidence for the use of a settled creed in the days of Tertullian is further enhanced by the names he uses for it. He calls it *Regula Fidei* (Rule of Faith); *Tessera* (the watchword); *Sacramentum* (oath or pledge), terms which also show clearly the purpose of the creed, that it formed the watchword by which Christians knew one another, and the form of teaching to which they had pledged themselves.

Thus by the end of the second century we have evidence showing the use of creeds in connection with Baptism (*i.e.*, Church membership); that already two types of creeds existed —the one resembling our Nicene Creed in the Eastern Church; the other the Apostles' Creed in the West; and that those of the East had a tendency to fuller statement.

IV.

THE APOSTLES' CREED.

About the year 390, Rufinus, a presbyter of the Christian Church, living at Aquileia, in N. Italy, undertook, at the request of a Christian Bishop, Laurentius, to write a commentary on the Apostles' Creed; at the beginning of his work he gives us the popular belief in his day concerning its origin:

"Our forefathers have handed down to us," he writes, "the tradition that after the Lord's Ascension, when through the coming of the Holy Ghost, tongues of flame had settled upon each of the Apostles, that they might speak diverse languages, so that no race, however foreign, no tongue, however barbarous, might be inaccessible to them, or beyond their reach, they were commanded by the Lord to go severally to the several nations to preach the Word. Being on the eve therefore of departing from one another they first mutually agreed upon a standard for their future preaching, lest haply when separate, they might in any instance vary the statements that they should make to those whom they should invite to believe in Christ. Being all, therefore, met together, and being filled with the Holy Ghost, they compose as we have said, this brief

formulary of their future preaching, each contributing his several sentence to one common summary, and they ordain that the rule thus framed shall be given to those who believe.

"To this formulary for many and most sufficient reasons they gave the name *Symbolum*. For *Symbolum* in Greek[1] answers to both *Indicium* (a sign or token) and *Collatio* (a joint contribution made by several) in Latin. For this the Apostles did in these words each contributing his several sentence.

"It is called *Indicium* or *Signum*, a sign or token, because at that time, as the Apostle Paul says, as is related in the Acts of the Apostles, many of the vagabond Jews pretended to be Apostles of Christ, and went about preaching for gain's sake or for their belly's sake, naming the name of Christ indeed, but not delivering their message according to the exact traditional lines. The Apostles, therefore, prescribed this formulary as a sign or token by which he who preached Christ truly according to the Apostolic rule might be recognised. Finally they say that in civil wars since the armour on both sides is alike, and the language the same, and the custom and mode of warfare the same; each general, to guard against treachery, is wont to deliver to his soldiers a distinct symbol or watchword—in Latin *signum*, or *indicium*—so that if one is met with, of whom it is doubtful

1 "Rufinus is undoubtedly wrong in connecting the name *Symbolum* with the tradition that it was a joint composition. His mistake is due to imperfect knowledge of Greek, and a comparison of two distinct Greek words, Συμβολον, which means a token or watchword, and Συμβολη, which means a joint contribution." (Gibson, "The Three Creeds," p. 44.)

to which side he belongs, being asked the symbol (watchword) he discloses whether he be friend or foe. And for this reason the tradition continues, the creed is not written on paper or parchment, but is retained in the hearts of the faithful, that it may be certain that no one has learnt it by reading, as is sometimes the case with unbelievers, but by tradition from the Apostles.

"The Apostles, therefore, as we have said, being about to separate to preach the Gospel, settled upon this sign or token of their agreement in the Faith; and, unlike the sons of Noah, who, when they were about to separate from one another builded a tower of baked bricks and pitch, whose top might reach to heaven, they raised a monument of faith which might withstand the enemy, composed of living stones and pearls of the Lord, such that neither winds might overthrow it, nor floods undermine it, nor the force of storms and tempests shake it. Right justly then, were the one, when, on the eve of separation, they builded a tower of pride, condemned to the confusion of tongues, so that no man might understand his neighbours' speech, while the others who were building a tower of faith were endowed with the knowledge and understanding of all languages, so that the former might prove a sign and token of sin, the latter of faith."

Then follows a commentary of considerable length on each separate clause of the creed which is given as follows:—

(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty, Invisible and Impassible.

(2) And in Jesus Christ, His Only Son, our Lord.

(3) Who was born of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.

(4) He was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried.

(5) He descended into hell. The third day He rose again from the dead.

(6) He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.

(7) From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

(8) And in the Holy Ghost.

(9) The Holy Church.

(10) The Forgiveness of Sins.

(11) The Resurrection of the Flesh.

This creed, Rufinus tells us, was in use in his own Church of Aquileia, but he is also aware that it differs from the one in use in his day by the Church of Rome, and from the creeds of the Eastern Church. He carefully notes that the Eastern Creeds speak of One God, the Father, and One Lord Jesus, and that his own creed has two phrases not found in the Creed of Rome, viz., "Invisible and Impassible" and "He descended into hell." The reason for the addition in the East was the growth of heresy in individual Churches, and he regards the Roman Creed as being the most ancient and the one which the Apostles left.

"I think it well to mention," he says, "that in different Churches some additions are found in this (the first) article. This is not the

case, however, with the Church of the city of Rome. The reason being, as I suppose, that on the one hand, no heresy has had its origin there, and on the other, that the ancient custom is kept up that those who are going to be baptized should recite the creed publicly, that is, in the audience of the people, the consequence of which is that the ears of those which are already believers will not admit the addition of a single word. But, in other places, as I understand, additions appear to have been made on account of certain heretics, by means of which novelty in doctrine, it was believed, might be excluded. We, however, follow the order which we received when we were baptized in the Church of Aquileia."

These statements of Rufinus are of great importance in tracing the history of the creeds. It will be well to epitomise the chief of them.

1st. There was a belief common in his day that the Apostles agreed upon a standard of their future preaching before they departed from one another—that this was the creed—each contributing his several sentence.

2nd. That this creed was called by the Apostles "Indicium," because it was to be a sign or token of the true Christian teacher, and the watchword by which Christians could know one another.

3rd. That it was the custom of the Church not to write the creed on paper or parchment, but it was retained in the minds of the faithful.

4th. That the Creed of Rome is regarded

by him as the original creed, but the creeds of the East are fuller, owing to heresy, and he himself employs a slightly fuller form.

With regard to the first statement the reader will be able to see for himself that there is no sufficient ground to suppose it to be verbally true, but yet we have every reason to believe that there was a common type of Apostolic teaching, out of which the creed of the baptized grew.

The second statement gives undoubtedly one of the uses of the creeds from the first ; they were, as Tertullian had already called them, "watchwords," by which Christians knew one another.

The custom of not writing the creed was mentioned by Irenæus (see p. 19), and it is also confirmed by S. Augustine in his sermon to catechumens. "Nobody writes the creed so that it may be read, but for saying it over with yourselves lest forgetfulness should obliterate what diligent instruction has delivered to you, let your memory be your book."

This custom largely accounts for the absence of actual creeds in the writing of the second and third centuries, and, therefore, the difficulty in tracing their origin.

The last statement is of great importance. It confirms the divergence of usage we had already noted in Irenæus and Tertullian, and shows that whilst Rufinus regarded the simpler

Creed of Rome as Apostolic he saw no reason to reject other forms, and preferred for himself the creed of his own Baptism.

THE OLD ROMAN CREED.

But the real importance of Rufinus is that he gives us a distinct point from which we can trace backwards and forwards the history of the Apostles' Creed. Removing the clauses which he tells us were peculiar to his Church of Aquileia we have the Creed of Rome known generally as the Old Roman Creed.

It runs as follows :—

(1) I believe in God, the Father Almighty.

(2) And in Christ Jesus, His Only Son, our Lord.

(3) Who was born of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.

(4) Was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried.

(5) Rose again from the dead the third day.

(6) Ascended into heaven. Sitteth on the right hand of the Father.

(7) From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

(8) And in the Holy Ghost.

(9) The Holy Church.

(10) The Forgiveness of Sins.

(11) The Resurrection of the Flesh.

This creed will be seen at once to differ considerably from our own creed, and it will be our task both to show how far back we can trace it, and also when and where it expanded into its present form.

THE EARLY USE OF THE OLD ROMAN CREED.

Fifty years before Rufinus we have another witness to the Old Roman Creed, Marcellus of Ancyra. He had, owing to Arian influence, been expelled from his See in A.D. 341, and went to Rome. Shortly afterwards he wrote to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, defending himself against heresy, and quotes a creed practically identical with the creed given by Rufinus. The creed omits the words "Father" (out of the first clause) and "Life everlasting." The letter and creed are preserved by a Greek named Epiphanius in Greek, and the latter is thought to be the old Greek Creed of the Roman Church, which in its early days was a Greek-speaking community.

Working backwards we find traces of the same creed in other writers, viz., in Felix of Rome (269—274), Novatian of Rome (A.D. 261), and Dionysius, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 259).

In A.D. 255 Cyprian of Carthage quotes the words "Dost thou believe in the remission of sins and eternal life through Holy Church?" which come from the interrogations put to the baptized. And, as we have seen, Tertullian quoted almost exactly the creed of his day, which, when compared with the Old Roman Creed of Marcellus and Rufinus is evidently identical with it or a later recension of it.

Critics have, therefore, felt justified in asserting that the Old Roman Creed, which is

undoubtedly the earliest form of our Apostles' Creed, was in use in Rome as early as the year A.D. 165.

THE EXPANSION OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

Accepting the conclusion that the Old Roman Creed is the earliest form of our creed we have now to trace the history of the additions made to it. Comparing it with our own creed we find they are as follows :—

(1) Maker of heaven and earth.
(2) Conceived.
(3) Suffered.
(4) Dead.
(5) He descended into hell.
(6) God . . . Almighty.
(7) Catholic.
(8) Communion of Saints.
(9) The Life Everlasting.

It is impossible to fix the exact place or date of any of the additions. The Old Roman Creed was the archetype of all the Western Creeds, but the latter differ in the extent and nature of their variation from it. Four distinct types of Western Creeds are known, namely, the Italian, the African, the Gallican, and the Spanish. Of these the Gallican Creeds approximate most closely to our own creed;

the Creed of Faustus, Bishop of Riez, A.D. 430, and Cæsarius of Arles, *c.* A.D. 500, show the growth of the additions, and the latter differs only from our own creed by the omission of the words "Maker of heaven and earth."

But the additions are all found earlier than either of them; all except the first are found in a creed known as *Fides Hieronymi.* (See page 36.) This was not a baptismal, but a private creed, thought to be the genuine work of S. Jerome. Dr. Gibson says of it: "In one of his letters S. Jerome mentions a formulary that he had sent to S. Cyril of Jerusalem, and it has been suggested that this is the very document of which he speaks. If so, it will belong to the year 377, or thereabouts." The creed is very much fuller than our Apostles' Creed, and contains much that is similar to the Nicene symbol; it has all the characteristics of an Eastern formula.

Another authority for them is the Creed of Niceta, Bishop of Remesiana, in Dacia, about the same date, which runs as follows:—

"I believe in God, the Father Almighty,
Maker of heaven and earth.
And in His Son Jesus Christ.
Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.
Suffered under Pontius Pilate.
Was crucified.
Dead.

The third day He rose again alive from the dead.

He ascended into heaven.

He sitteth at the right hand of the Father.

From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Catholic Church.

The Communion of Saints.

The Remission of Sins.

The Resurrection of the flesh and life eternal."

It is thought the Apostles' Creed which we now use was a Gallican recension of the Old Roman Creed, and Professor Harnack calls it "The Baptismal Confession of the Church of Southern Gaul," although a recent writer (Dr. Burn) has put forward the view that Rome "never really dropped the use of her old baptismal creed," but that it was transformed into our present form in Rome itself "by the gradual absorption of clauses." (Burn, "Introduction to the Creeds," page 221.)

Not a single one of the clauses contains anything novel in the way of doctrine, and almost all are to be found in writers previous to the time of Rufinus, but they had not found a place in the Creed of Rome.

The words "Maker of heaven and earth" are found in the "Apology of Aristides" (A.D. 120); in Irenæus, and Tertullian; and Clemens

Romanus (A.D. 90) uses the phrase "Maker of the whole world." They are of Eastern origin, and were evidently employed against the great Gnostic heresy, which ascribed the work of creation to a lesser and subordinate deity.

The word *conceptus* is found in the writings of Ignatius A.D. 110.

The clause "Descended into hell" was in the creed used at the baptism of Rufinus, and he notes it as one of the differences between the creed of his own Church (Aquileia) and the Creed of Rome. The phrase is found in the writings of Irenæus (A.D. 180). The Scriptural evidence for it is, S. Luke xxiii. 43; Acts ii. 27, 31; Eph. iv. 9, 10; 1 Peter iii. 19. It is a far more important addition than those with which we have already dealt. Two reasons have been given for its insertion in the Apostles' Creed, either that it was to counteract the Docetic teaching in the East that Christ had merely a phantom body, or that it was added to complete the account of His Passion.

There has been much controversy over the term "Catholic." (See page 46.) It is sufficient now to point out that though the word is not found in the New Testament we meet with it as early as Ignatius of Antioch (A.D. 110); Tertullian adds it as a title of the Church, speaking of the *Catholica Ecclesia*, and it was in common use from his time onward.

The important addition of the phrase

"Communion of Saints" is shrouded in much mystery. It would appear to be of Eastern origin. In the early days there was a doubt as to its exact meaning, some interpreting it to mean "The Communion of holy things," others the "Communion of holy persons."

The first meaning naturally referred to the Sacraments, particularly to the Eucharist. Thus in the thirteenth century the "Lay Folks' Mass Book" has the metrical paraphrase:—

> "Well I trow in the holi gost
> And holi kire that is so gode;
> And so I trow that housel es
> Bothe flesshe and blode."

This view was not the most general one, and its meaning really was the fellowship both between the saints on earth with one another and between the living and the departed.

The phrase "The Life Everlasting" was used in the African Church in the third century, and is quoted by Cyprian of Carthage. It is found first in the Apostles' Creed, as given by Augustine to the catechumens.

Our knowledge of these additions will be seen to be very incomplete; all we can do is to mark the first writer who uses them, and the first extant copy of a creed in which they are found.

The creed as it now stands is found first in the year A.D. 750 in the writings of Pirminius, a Gallican missionary.

THE *FIDES HIERONYMI*.

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of things visible and invisible.

I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, born of God, God of God, Light of light, Almighty of Almighty, True God of True God, Born before the ages, not made, by Whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, Who for our salvation descended from heaven, and was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered by suffering under Pontius Pilate, under Herod the King, crucified, buried, descended into hell, trod down the sting of death, rose again the third day, appeared to the Apostles. After this, He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, thence shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, God not unbegotten nor begotten, not created nor made, but co-eternal with the Father and the Son. I believe in remission of sins, in the Holy Catholic Church, Communion of Saints, resurrection of the flesh unto eternal life. Amen."

the equality and the unity of the Persons. How could we baptize into the name of God and Paul, or into the name of the Father and of Peter? the very linking of the name of the Son with the Father in this sacred act of initiation proclaims His equality, but it is more emphatic when we note the use of the singular—into the Name, Christ thus confirms the equality, whilst He teaches us the Unity. (See 1 Cor. i.)

Yet we are told that in the earliest form of the creed when the Christian professed his faith in God the Father, he thought only of God as the Father of the universe (*i.e.*, of a creative Paternity), not as the Father of the Everlasting Son. Had the Church limited her sense of the clause to this she would indeed have departed from the teaching of her Founder, Who continually spake of God as "My Father," and in such a way to show that He claimed a unique relationship (S. Matt. xi. 20, ff). It is impossible to sever the words "I believe in God the Father" from the clause as "in Jesus Christ His only Son." Just as Father and Son stand together, each the complement of the other in the baptismal formula, so do they here; nor can the

---

device of later times in conflict with the whole drift of the creed. The expansion was so contrived *as to describe more closely the three members of the baptismal formula* — Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Christian community felt the need of plainly defining them so as to confess before all men what she possessed in them, and through her faith in them." (Prof. Harnack's "Pamphlet on the Apostles' Creed," 1893.)

relationship be explained away by limiting the Sonship to the historic Jesus, whilst denying His pre-existence. The doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence as Son of God is too deeply embedded in the teaching of the Apostles to find no expression in the early Church. "God sent forth His Son born of a woman," says S. Paul; so also the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son," nor is there a suggestion that the Son is in any way different in position from that Eternal Logos "Who was made flesh and dwelt among us." He is the same Jesus Christ "Who was with the Father before the worlds and appears at the end of time," says S. Ignatius in A.D. 110.

It is true that certain writers in the second century confuse the use of the terms, "Son" and "Logos," ascribing the former only to Christ in His historic manifestation. The term "only Son" comes from the fourth Gospel, which, even if we conceded to it a date as late as A.D. 110 would still be older than the Old Roman Creed, and its use there is quite clear. "The only-begotten Son, Which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." [1]

THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Here again the Church has been accused of

[1] See Harnack, "The Apostles' Creed," 1901, p. 73.

going beyond the early teaching, and putting a false interpretation upon the clause. It is urged that in the earliest teaching the Holy Spirit was conceived to be a Power or Gift, not a Personality, and that it was in this sense the writer of the Creed believed in Him. If he did he had fallen away from the conception of the Holy Spirit of the author of the fourth Gospel and the Acts and S. Paul. In S. John xiv.-xvi. a strong masculine form ἐκεῖνος (=*he*) is used of Him. His office, title and work all depict Personality. He takes up the personal work of Christ, He is another "Advocate"—Jesus the first, the Holy Spirit the second; He is to be the Guide and Illuminator of the Apostles; He is to convince the world of sin, of judgment, and of righteousness (S. John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7-15).

His Personality is equally clear in the Acts. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us" (Acts xv. 28), write the elders at Jerusalem to the Church at Antioch. This is no mere influence or power. So, too, S. Peter accuses Ananias of lying to the Holy Ghost (v. 3).

S. Paul's language is equally clear: "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and He that searcheth the heart knoweth what is *the mind of the Spirit*, because He maketh intercession

for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. viii. 26, R.V.). "The Spirit here can only be thought of as distinct from the Father with Whom He intercedes, nor can there be any personification of, or confusion with, the human spirit, since the Spirit 'helpeth our infirmities,' and 'maketh intercession for us.'" (Gibson on the Articles, page 203: compare also 1 Cor. xii. 4, ff.; Eph. iv. 30; Gal. v. 18.)

So, too, we find no less clearly the Personality of the Spirit in Clemens Romanus (A.D. 90). "Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace which was poured out upon us?" Again, "As God lives and the Lord Jesus Christ lives and the Holy Spirit, the faith and hope of the elect." Surely here there is no conception of the Spirit as a mere influence from the Father, but as personal as the Father and the Son are personal.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

The next charge against the creed is that it has added the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. "It is one of the best established results of history" (says Professor Harnack) "that the clause 'born of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary' does not belong to the earliest Gospel preaching, and for these reasons: (1) It is wanting in all the Epistles of S. Paul, and, moreover, in all the Epistles of the New Testament. (2) It is not to be found in the Gospel of Mark, nor for certain in that according to John. (3) It

was not included in the original materials of Matthew and Luke and in the sources common to both. (4) The genealogies of Jesus contained in both these Gospels go back to Joseph and not to Mary. (5) All four Gospels bear witness, two of them directly, and two of them indirectly, that the first proclamation of Jesus as Messiah dated from His Baptism. It is as certain that the birth of Jesus of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary had no place in the first preaching as it is that by the middle, or probably even soon after the beginning of the second century, the belief had become an established part of the Church tradition."

These are weighty and confident words from a most eminent scholar, but they fail distinctly upon this crucial point, they do not even suggest a reason for the growth of this doctrine in so brief a space of time within the early Church. Let us first examine the evidence for the Virgin Birth.

(1) The Matthew narrative consists of the genealogy, the story of Joseph's perplexity when he finds the woman who was to be his wife already with child, and the Birth.

(2) The Lucan narrative is the story of Mary; it consists of the Annunciation and of the Birth, and also a second genealogy, containing the important words "being the son as was supposed of Joseph." It is clear that these are quite independent accounts and

genealogies. Leaving the difficult question of the text of Matthew i. 16[1] as unnecessary for our immediate purpose, we cannot doubt that even if Harnack's contention be true that the narrative was not in the original material, yet it did find a place in the work of the compiler by A.D. 75. "Whatever the amount of historical fact here recorded may be, there is no reason why these traditions should not have been recorded before the year A.D. 75; this date is chosen as the latest possible limit." (Allen's "S. Matthew," Intro. lxxxv.)

Thus then the story of the Virgin Birth was sufficiently well known to be placed in a history of Christ's life less than ten years after the deaths of S. Peter and S. Paul.

Again as to the Lucan narrative. Three years ago and thirteen years after his famous attack on the creed, Harnack published his work "Luke the Physician." In it he accepts the author of the third Gospel as S. Luke, who he says, "At Ephesus or some place in Asia or Achaia, about the year A.D. 80, wrote his history for the 'excellent Theophilus.'. His chief authority for the Gospel was the work of S. Mark, his late companion in Rome; besides this he employed for the Lord's life a second source, which he shared with S. Matthew; and thirdly,

[1] For the text of S. Matthew i. 16 the student should consult Sanday's Art. on "Jesus Christ" in Hastings' Dict. of the Bible.

he is dependent upon special traditions which had their origin in Jerusalem and Judæa." So that, if we accept his own date, Harnack now admits that the story of the Virgin birth had its origin in Jerusalem or Judæa before the year A.D. 80. Thus we have double and independent testimony that the Virgin Birth was well known in the Church between A.D. 70 and 80.

Further: this story was so well authenticated that S. Luke, the companion of S. Paul, and the man who used the work of S. Mark—a man described by Professor Ramsay as "among the historians of the first rank"—accepted it as part of the true account of Jesus, of which he claims to have "a more accurate knowledge." Further still: if we follow Professor Ramsay and Professor Sanday, S. Luke's authority was none other than the Virgin Mary herself, and S. Luke i. and ii. belong to the very earliest Gospel tradition.

How then can we account for the silence of S. Mark and the Epistles? Of S. Mark we need feel no surprise; he begins not at the birth or parentage, but at the public ministry; it did not fall within his purpose. Light is thrown upon the silence of S. Paul and the Catholic Epistles by the fact that there is an equal silence in the Acts, and yet it comes from the same hand as the third Gospel. But the answer is surely to be found in the devout contempla-

tion of what the Virgin Birth really implies. Haeckel has preserved for the present day the infamous story current in Jewish literature of the second century, and he has at least done the Church this good service, he has shown how impossible it would have been to place the Virgin Birth in the public preaching of the Apostles. It was too sacred to expose it to the jibes of the Jew and the mockery of the Greek.

The perplexity of Joseph was but the foreshadowing of what was to come. The silence of the New Testament writers is the silence of devotion, broken only when the historical narrative demanded, and then given in unique truthfulness and simplicity.

Certain it is that belief in the Virgin Birth was current many decades before Harnack makes it an established part of the Church tradition.

THE TERM "CATHOLIC."

Of the "added clauses" most exception has been taken to the word "Catholic." Professor Harnack thus states it :—

"The description of the Church as 'Catholic' is a very old one in ecclesiastical literature, at least as old as the Old Roman Creed, and it first appears in the East. Originally it meant nothing more than the 'universal' Church, the whole Christian community called of God on earth. The idea of applying it to

the concrete visible Church was not yet thought of. Consequently, if the word had been taken up in the Old Roman Creed, we should have to understand it there in this first sense. But after the end of the second and the beginning of the third century the word 'Catholic' took a second meaning, which gradually came to be regarded in the West as of equal authority with the first. It described the visible and orthodox Churches, which, under definite organisation, had grouped themselves round the Apostolic foundations, and especially round Rome, as distinguished from heretical communities."

Now it is true that, with the growth of heresy, the term "Catholic" came to have "an exclusive as well as a comprehensive meaning" (Swete, "The Apostles' Creed," page 80), but it is not true that those who first used it of the Church did not conceive the Church to be a "visible and concrete society." It is used first by Ignatius in his epistle to the Church at Smyrna: "Wheresoever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." Now, no sub-Apostolic writer has stated more clearly what he conceives to be the Church than Ignatius, in his letter to the *Trallians*. He says: "In like manner let all men respect deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the council of God, and as the college of Apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a Church." At the time of the death of Polycarp the Church at Smyrna

addressed a circular letter to "all the congregations of the Holy and Catholic Church in every place."

Thus it is clear that Harnack is wrong in asserting that it was not applied to the visible concrete Church. He is equally wrong in suggesting that it has peculiar reference to communion with Rome. The phrase is especially Eastern, and even in such Western writers as Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine it is used to denote all the Churches of the East and West. The truth concerning the word is that whilst it has ever retained the idea of "universality," it came to have a secondary meaning of "orthodox," as opposed to "heretical."

Two passages concerning the creed in Harnack's "The Apostles' Creed, 1901" (Translation), may be appended.

(i.) Concerning the Old Roman Creed he writes:—"The fact that in the Roman symbol older and shorter 'kerugmatic' sentences were somewhat further developed under the influence of the New Testament writings, and, particularly under that of John, the Synoptists, Paul and probably the Acts of the Apostles, makes it unwise to trace the composition of the symbol backwards beyond the middle of the second century" (page 75). We are glad of this witness to the unity between the early creed and the New Testament writings.

(ii.) Concerning the nature of the "added clauses," he writes:—"Of most of them it may be said that they are a natural elaboration of the old symbol; that they do not alter its character; that they contain only the common faith of the Church, even of the Church of the second century, and that at the end of the second century they were also known to the Churches of the West, even though they had not yet found a stable place in any of the provincial symbols (page 86).

VI.

NICENE CREED.

The history of the Nicene Creed is simpler than that of the Apostles' Creed. It takes its name from the Council of Nicea, which met in A.D. 325, to deal with the teaching of the heresiarch Arius.

Arius had been educated at Antioch, in the school of Lucian, and had passed thence to Alexandria. He lived at the close of the period when the Church had been distressed by the heresy known as Sabellianism. The essence of this was the denying of the distinction between the Three Persons in the Trinity. Sabellius asserted that the terms "Father, Son and Holy Ghost" represented but the three forms or characters under which God had manifested Himself to man, but that He was not really three, but one. Arianism was to an extent a revulsion from this; Arius accused his own Bishop Alexander of Alexandria of this heresy, but fell himself into the error of so far magnifying the distinctions between Father and Son as to deny the true Oneness of the Persons. If Christ was Son, then there was a time when He

was not, therefore He could not have been eternally God; further, that though the object of worship He was really but the highest of God's creatures, and an intermediary between God and man.

Never, perhaps, in the history of Christendom, has a heresy caused such popular excitement as did this in Alexandria. Every class of the community discussed it from the highest to the lowest; it threatened even to disturb the peace of the Empire, and Constantine determined to intervene.

THE COUNCIL OF NICEA.

Thus was summoned the first great General Council at Nicea in Bithynia, to which came about three hundred Christian bishops. The Arians were represented by about seventeen Bishops, Arius and their future leader, Eusebius of Nicomedia.

Alexander of Alexandria, with his deacon Athanasius, Hosius of Cordova, Marcellus of Ancyra (known to us already in connection with the Apostles' Creed), were the chief opponents of the heresy.

Between the two parties were the great mass of the bishops who knew little of the controversy, so sudden had been its growth, and, therefore, scarcely appreciated either its tendencies or its strength.

Representative of the chief thought of his day was another Eusebius—Bishop of Cæsarea

—a man of clear intelligence and wisdom, and of liberal views. In answer to a creed offered to the Council by his namesake of Nicomedia he put forward the creed used by his own Church at Baptism; this became the parent of our own Nicene Creed. As put forward by Eusebius in the Council it was as follows:—

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, before all worlds begotten of the Father, by Whom all things were made: Who for our Salvation was made flesh and lived among men, and suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the quick and the dead.

"And we believe in the Holy Ghost."

So far as it went the creed was essentially Scriptural, and dealt very fully with the doctrine of the Person of Christ, but yet it failed to meet the exact need of the moment. "The question before the Council was not as to the acceptance of the language of Scripture, but as to its meaning and the interpretation to be put upon it." (Gibson's "The Three Creeds," page 121.)

The discussion showed the Arians were not prepared to accept the essential Divinity of the Son; a term was needed, therefore, which

should make this clear; it was found probably by Hosius of Cordova in the term "Homoousios" (of one substance),[1] and to this the Emperor is said to have asked the Bishops to assent. Various objections were raised to it, it was unscriptural, it was Sabellian, it had already been condemned by the Council of Antioch A.D. 268, and it was novel; but it was finally accepted by all except the extreme Arians. Besides this great addition the doctrine of Sonship was more fully stated, and the creed emanated from the Council as follows:—

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in One Lord Jesus Christ, *the Son of God*, only begotten *of the Father—that is of the substance of the Father*—God of God, Light of Light, *Very God of Very God*, Begotten *not made*, *being of one substance with the Father*; By Whom all things were made, *both that are in heaven and that are in earth*, Who *for us men and* for our salvation *came down and* was incarnate *and was made man*; suffered and rose again the third day, ascended *into heaven; is coming* to judge the quick and the dead.

"And in the Holy Ghost."

The additions are in italics; they dealt with two points—the nature of the pre-incarnate

1 "The Greek word οὐσια is not very happily translated by us, *Substance*, as this latter word, in its popular sense, suggests something material. What is meant by it is rather *essence* or *nature*." (Gibson's "The Three Creeds," p. 22.)

Son and the truth of His Incarnation. No room for doubt was left as to the Church's mind upon the Godhead of the Son ; it is reiterated in the phrases used. The reason for the additions concerning the Incarnation is unknown unless the Council desired to emphasise the completeness of His Humanity as she had done of the Godhead.

The creed closes abruptly like that presented by Eusebius with the phrase "We believe in the Holy Ghost." It is generally believed that the Creed of Cæsarea did not really end thus, but that it contained some further clauses on the Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection, and that Eusebius merely recited it as far as was necessary for the purpose ; and that the Council since they were putting forth not a baptismal formula, but a test of orthodoxy, left it as Eusebius had given it.

THE CREED AFTER NICEA.

The history of the further expansion of the creed is a tale of conflict with heresy. Three men were chiefly instrumental in causing this—Marcellus of Ancyra, Apollinaris, and Macedonius—the first two were ardent opponents of Arianism, and fell into error through passing to an opposite extreme.

Marcellus of Ancyra was at Nicea, and an ardent champion of orthodoxy ; he seems, however, in his endeavour to uphold the absolute

Divinity of Christ, to have drawn a distinction between the "Word of God" and "the Son."

"The Logos (or Word) by a sort of expansion of the Divine Unity became temporarily related to Jesus, Who, as the chosen organ for its manifestation, the man whose being was filled with its presence, was called the 'Son,' and 'Image of God'; but from whom in God's appointed time the Logos would withdraw itself, and relapse by a movement of contraction into the bosom of Divinity."

The teaching of Apollinaris tended to destroy our Lord's perfect Humanity. In order to protect Him against the idea of taking a sinful nature he denied that our Lord had a pure human will, because the will was the seat of sin; thus of the three parts of man, body, soul, and spirit, he made our Lord assume but two—body and soul, but that the place of the spirit, or rational part of man was taken by the Divine Logos. Apollinaris thus destroyed the perfect Humanity, and with it the force of Christ's example and His redemptive work.

The error of Macedonius concerned the Holy Spirit. He was Bishop of Constantinople in A.D. 360, and deposed by the Arians. His personal history after his deposition is hardly known, and his connection with the heresy which bears his name somewhat obscure. There had been even before his day a loose way of speaking of the Holy Spirit; since He was called in Scripture the Spirit of Christ some

were led to refuse to give to Him an equality within the Trinity, and spoke of Him as a "creature of a creature."

All three of these heresies led to an expansion of the Creeds of the East. To meet the error of Marcellus we find the Council of Antioch in 341 and several other Arian Councils adding clauses to maintain the eternity of the Kingdom of Christ and Cyril of Jerusalem in 348 in his *Catechetical Lectures* comments on the words "Whose kingdom shall have no end" (compare Luke i. 33), which were in the baptismal creed of his Church as follows:—"A certain one has dared to affirm that after the end of the world, Christ shall reign no longer," referring to the errors of Marcellus.

Additions against the errors of Apollinaris and Macedonius are found a little later in the work of Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis (circ. 373) called "Ancoratus." In this he gives us two formularies—the more important is as follows:—

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker *of heaven and earth, and* of all things visible and invisible.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, *Begotten of His Father before all worlds*—that is of the substance of the Father—Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made, Being of one substance with the Father, By Whom all things were made, both that are in heaven and that

are in earth, Who for us men and for our salvation came down *from heaven*, and was incarnate *of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*, and was made man, and *was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate and* suffered, and *was buried, and* rose again the third day *according to the Scriptures*, and ascended into heaven, and *sitteth at the right hand of the Father*, and is coming *again with glory* to judge the quick and the dead, *Whose kingdom shall have no end.*

"And in the Holy Ghost, *the Lord and Life Giver, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the prophets; in One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge One Baptism for the remission of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen.*"

It will be seen at a glance that there is very considerable difference, as marked by italics, between this creed and that of Nicea; further, the reader will recognise it as almost exactly similar to the creed which stands in our own Communion Office. The additions deal with all three heresies; the perfect Humanity, and the eternal kingdom of Christ are emphasised against Apollinaris and Marcellus, and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is fully and completely stated at the end of the creed to combat the errors of Macedonianism.

The origin of this creed is a matter of uncertainty. Dr. Hort, who wrote "Two Dissertations" (1876) on it held that it was not a

revised form of the Nicene Creed, but the Creed of Jerusalem expanded by the insertion of the Nicene clauses on the pre-Incarnate Christ, together with additions from the Creeds of Antioch and the *Apostolic Constitutions;* this view is ably criticised by Dr. Gibson in "The Three Creeds" (pages 169-174), and he abandons it in favour of the view that the enlarged creed was framed "by a deliberate process of comparing local forms of the creed, such as those of Jerusalem, Antioch and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, borrowing from any of them clauses that it was deemed desirable to insert in the original Nicene Creed, and completing that creed by the addition of the concluding articles following expression of belief in the Holy Spirit."

At the General Council of Chalcedon this creed (as well as the Nicene symbol) was given authority by a decree of the Council where it is given *in extenso*, omitting the words "that is of the substance of the Father" and "both that are in heaven and that are in earth," but referred to as having been sanctioned at Constantinople in A.D. 381.

Its sanction by the Council of Constantinople is involved in some doubt, the only creed stated by the great historians of the time to have been sanctioned then was the Creed of Nicea, and, as we have seen, even at Chalcedon *it was not substituted for the Nicene symbol.*

We have still, therefore, to trace the story of its gradually assuming the place and taking the title of the creed sanctioned at the first General Council.

DIVERGENT USE IN EAST AND WEST.

Thus far we have seen both forms of the creed used chiefly for Baptism and as a test of orthodoxy at the Councils. Between 476-488 Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch, ordered the recitation of the Nicene Creed in the Communion Office, and twenty years or so later the Patriarch of Constantinople did the same; the shorter form of Nicea was displaced in 565 (circ.) by the order of the Emperor Justin II. by the fuller form, and its use gradually became general throughout the Eastern Church where it took the name as well as the place of the original Nicene symbol.

In Western Christendom the Creed of Nicea was but slightly known until long after the Council of Chalcedon. Hilary of Poictiers A.D. 350 tells us that it was not until he had been a bishop some years that he even heard of it, and we have to pass down two centuries further before we come to clear evidence of its use.

At the Council of Toledo, in Spain, in 589, the Spanish Bishops, in consequence of the Arian heresy which had long been paramount there, formally accepted the decisions of the

four great Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, and the two forms of the creed, ordering the fuller form to be recited by the people at the Communion Office. The form thus ordered differs, however, in two respects from the one given us by Epiphanius, and contained two additional statements, viz., "God of God," and the famous "Filioque" clause after "Who proceedeth from the Father."

By the latter part of the seventh century it was in use in the Frankish Church, and it is found in the Vatican MS. of the Gelasian Sacramentary, but without the two new clauses. Its use in the fullest form was ordered and upheld in the Frankish kingdom by Charlemagne, although some little discussion had already arisen over the Filioque clause.

At the beginning of the ninth century, however, arose the great controversy which was to split the Church in twain. It had its earliest beginnings through some Latin monks, who had a convent on the Mount of Olives, and who were using the full form ; their Eastern brethren charged them with heresy, and they appealed to Leo III of Rome; the result was the calling of the Council of Aachen in A.D. 809, which confirmed the practice of the monks, yet Leo, whilst upholding the doctrine of the double procession, deprecated the use of the Filioque clause as unauthorised, and suggested that the

Frankish Church should discontinue the singing of the creed at the Mass, a custom not in force at Rome; further it is said that by his order the creed was engraved upon two silver shields, the one in Latin and the other in Greek, without the clause, and these were set up in S. Peter's.

For two centuries the controversy ceased so far as Rome was concerned, but in 1014, through the influence of the Emperor, Henry II, the creed, according to the German use, was sung in the Mass at Rome by order of Benedict VIII; in other parts of the West, also its use continued to spread, and the Eastern Church from this time onward continually charged their brethren of the West with the use of an unauthorised form, and one also unsound in doctrine. The Eastern Church regarded the clause as destroying the Catholic belief that the Father is the sole source of the Godhead. Such a charge is unfounded, Western Christendom has continually disclaimed any intention of going beyond the meaning of Scripture; and has asserted that her doctrine in no way differs from the Greek form "proceeding from the Father through the Son."

VII.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

All that we know of the date and the authorship of this famous creed can be told in a few words; from the tenth century to the Reformation it was regarded as the work of the saint whose name it bears, but from that time men began to inquire into and criticise the received tradition, and in the reign of Charles I a certain prebend of Canterbury, a Dutchman by birth, Gerard Voss, boldly attacked the traditional authorship, and not without good grounds. The creed is undoubtedly not the work of Athanasius, it is a *Latin* hymn, whereas Athanasius wrote in Greek; it makes the greatest use of the works of S. Augustine, which were written a considerable time after the death of S. Athanasius, and also one at least of the heresies referred to in it (Apollinarianism) was not condemned by the Church till some time after his death. If then Athanasius was not the author, who wrote it? how did it come to bear its present title? The first question has been the subject of much research and considerable controversy, and is still uncertain; from the day of Voss onwards the subject has been

disputed. Archbishop Ussher in 1647, Waterland in 1723, wrote learned works upon it, and in recent times we have had almost endless works dealing with it. The essence of the evidence has been most admirably gathered together by the present Bishop of Gloucester; his points may be epitomised as follows:—

(1) Representative writers in France in the ninth century freely cited it as the work of S. Athanasius, and it was appealed to by the monks of Mount Olivet in A.D. 809 in the controversy concerning the Filioque clause.

(2) In the same century it was frequently ordered to be learned by heart by the clergy.

(3) One Canon as early as 670 (the Canon of Autun) states: "If any presbyter, deacon, sub-deacon, or clerk doth not without mistake recite the creed which the Apostles delivered by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and also *the faith of the holy prelate Athanasius*, let him be censured by the bishop."

(4) The earliest manuscript evidence goes back, perhaps, to the eighth century; the creed is usually found at the end of Psalters and with the Canticles, Te Deum, Gloria in Excelsis, etc.

(5) The earliest commentary on it may go back to the end of the sixth century.

(6) The earliest quotations of it are found in the writing of Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles (502-42); Avitus, Bishop of Vienne (490-518) and by Vincentius of Lerins (450).

The Bishop thinks its date must be sought between 420 and 450.

"On the whole," he says, "we can scarcely arrive at any more definite conclusion than this. The *Quicunque Vult* cannot have been written before 420. It is possibly earlier than 450. It cannot be later than the sixth century." Opinions have differed concerning the author; Cæsarius of Arles, Vincent of Lerins, and Honoratus of Arles are the chief names now held to be probable, but the evidence is quite uncertain, and does not justify any positive statement.

How the creed obtained its name we cannot tell. Various conjectures have been made, but in the absence of evidence they are of little value; it may have been an error, it may have been because the creed was thought to embody the doctrines of Athanasius.

OBJECTIONS TO ITS USE.

The objections which are raised at the present time against the Athanasian Creed are by no means new; continued opposition to it dates back to the days of the Reformation.

The creed has always found able defenders from Richard Hooker, in the days of Elizabeth, to Bishop Gibson, in our own day. The fact that the English Church adhered so rigidly to it in the sixteenth century, when Continental reformers lightly laid it aside, is worthy of note. The English divines saw in it the best safe-

guard against the many forms of doctrinal error so rife at the time, especially the revival of Arianism, "Against which poison," said Hooker, "if we think that the Church at this day needeth not those ancient preservatives which ages before us were so glad to use, we deceive ourselves greatly."

The same plea was urged in the eighteenth century by Waterland: "As long as there shall be any men left to oppose the doctrines which this creed contains, so long will it be expedient, and even necessary, to continue the use of it in order to preserve the rest."

This is still the chief ground urged for its retention. No age has been free from error on the doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, and the Incarnate Person of Christ, and it is held that no formula meets the error so well as this. "It has probably done more than any other single document to explain and bring home to Church people what is really meant by the doctrines of the Holy Trnity and the Incarnation." (Gibson.)

THE CONDEMNATORY CLAUSES.

(1) Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith except every-one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

(2) He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(3) This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

These are the clauses which are the grounds of objection, as they now stand in our Prayer Book.

Unfortunately we are faced not only with a difference of opinion as to their use, but as to the actual meaning of the words. (See Glossary, page 105.) Scholars do not even agree as to whether the creed is intended to set forth *the general terms of salvation for everyone;* or whether they are meant to apply *only to cases of apostasy from the Faith.* Bishop Gibson, after a careful examination of the language of the creed, declares "the warnings of the creed are directed against apostasy from the Christian Faith, and they do not in any sense concern the heathen, or those who have been brought up in hereditary error."

So also Dr. Mozley: "It is meant (*i.e.*, the formula of the creed) to express that eternal punishment is the sentence upon all who reject the true Faith, being really responsible for this rejection, and have nothing to excuse them in the circumstances of their education and situation, and the influences to which they have been exposed."

So, again, Dr. A. E. Burn, in his exhaus-

tive book on the creeds: "The clause (*i.e.*, the second clause) asserts only that disloyalty to faith must lead to spoiling of character, and thus to the eternal perishing from which in our Litany we pray to be delivered." (Burn's "Introduction to the Creeds," page 291.)

Quite the opposite view was taken by the present Dean of Westminster in his lectures given in Westminster Abbey in Advent, 1903:

"I do not think" (he says) "that it is fair to plead that these words are addressed only to the Church's children as a solemn reminder that they who have been baptized in the faith must keep it to the end. That is not the obvious meaning of the words 'Whosoever wishes to be saved,' nor of the phrase 'everyone' in the following clause. They are a world-wide challenge. I can think of no more inclusive words. Certainly, when they were written they were intended as a statement of the universal condition of salvation. They were designed to make it clear to the Arian conquerors of Southern Gaul that, in the opinion of the Catholic Church, they were on the certain road to perdition. They were very bold words, and they were meant to be absolutely uncompromising. . . It is vain to quarrel with the translation. The Latin is not a whit less terrible than the English. They (the writers) knew what they were saying and they meant it." ("Some Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed," page 43).

We can, however, clear the ground so far as the English Church is concerned by pointing out that whenever Convocation has dealt with

the creed (see page 73) from 1689 onwards it has always adopted the view that the creed is addressed to the Church's children against the *perils of apostasy*.

That, then, has been the declared intention of the English Church in her use of the creed, quite apart from the question of its original meaning.

Yet the Dean of Westminster's interpretation represents *the sense which the present English wording conveys;* and this is shown, not only by the many protests against it, but by the reiterated efforts for a retranslation and the voluminous and minute explanations given to the words by the creed's most ardent champions.

There is, therefore, just cause for complaint; to use the words of the Dean of Westminster: "The frame does grave injustice to the picture"; and Bishop Gibson clearly admits both the "common" misunderstanding and the need of a new translation.

"If a new translation were accompanied by an explanatory note introduced with it into the text of the Prayer Book, such as those which stand after the order of the Holy Communion and the Public Baptism of Infants, it is very possible that in a short time the common misunderstanding of the meaning of the creed would disappear." (Gibson, "The Three Creeds," page 257.)

THE EXPEDIENCY OF ITS USE.

Apart from the vexed question of the "damnatory clauses" there is the question of the expediency of using so technical a statement in the services of the Church.

Many urge that it would be an incalculable loss if the creed were omitted, and amongst them some who would excise the objectionable parts. They urge that, with the advance of education in all other matters, we should aim at an instructed laity, and that it is wrong and foolish to use the argument of the ignorant or unlearned layman as a plea for removing the creed from the whole body of the laity; further that the omission of the rubric directing its use would speedily relegate the creed to obscurity. "If it still stood in the Prayer Book, but with no rubric for its use, it would soon be as unfamiliar to most of us as the prayers for use at sea." ("Some Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed," page 63.) Yet even earnest supporters of it see the unfitness of its present position.

Dr. A. E. Burn suggests that the clergy should be permitted by episcopal authority to read it to their congregations, which was a primitive use. "It sometimes," he says, "offends one's sense of reverence to hear this solemn statement of the mysteries of our faith chanted too sonorously by a choir, or gabbled by Sunday School children" (page 294).

A further plea for its retention is its useful-

ness on the mission field, especially in the East; but this is surely a two-edged argument, and the very variety of mission work is the strongest argument for latitude in its use in the Church's services. That which may appeal to the Hindoo or the Chinese may be worthless for use in a service in the hut of an Eskimo, or of the poor settler in the bush, or in the kraal of the Kaffir.

On the whole, the temper of the Church towards the use and retention of the creed finds its best expression in discussions and reports upon it of late years in the Lambeth Conferences; at that Conference we have bishops from every part of the great Anglican Communion, men whose business it is to take a wide outlook over the Church's work, and to provide for the needs of all, and they have not hesitated to acknowledge that there are *real* difficulties in the use and wording of the creed as it now stands.

The real danger to-day is lest amidst bitter controversy the real value of the creed be lost by relegating it to obscurity, when it should be within the power of the Church to *order* her priests to expound it on suitable occasions to the people.

The objections concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, as stated in the creed, belong to a different category. They come from those who either do not believe the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, or from those whose tendency is to

lapse downwards to a doubtful view of the full Divinity of Jesus. It is unfair to class with these the objections raised to the obscurity of the language of the creed, and its fitness for general use. The creed is most valuable as a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity for the clergy, which was its earliest use, and to return to this usage could not in any way jeopardise the catholicity of the English Church.

STAGES OF THE CONTROVERSY.

A brief review of the controversies which have raged round this question of the use of this creed since the Reformation shows how deeply men have felt about it.

On the Continent the Reformers made light work of getting rid of it, although the unseemly jest of Valentius Gentilis, who called it the Creed "of Sathanasius" detracted much from the dignity of the attack.

Thomas Cartwright was the first to assail it in England, and was answered by Archbishop Whitgift and Richard Hooker, who saw in it a bulwark against the growth of the many forms of heresy which had sprung up during the Reformation, especially the Socinian. (See page 82.)

The Puritan party, as a body, raised no objection to its use, either at the Hampton Court Conference or the Savoy Conference,

but there was a tendency to neglect it in the early part of the seventeenth century.

Richard Baxter probably expressed the feelings of many of his day—and since—in his neatly worded criticism : "In a word, the damnatory sentences excepted or modestly expounded, I embrace the creed called Athanasius' as the best explication of the Trinity." Jeremy Taylor had the same objection to it. "I confess I cannot see the moderate sentence and gentleness of charity in his preface and conclusion, as there was in the Nicene Creed. Nothing there but damnation and perishing everlastingly unless the article of the Trinity be believed as it is there with curiosity and minute particularities explained."

Under William and Mary, a Committee was appointed in 1689 to revise the Prayer Book, and the question of the rejection of the creed was raised, but defeated ; it was further suggested that it should be made optional, the damnatory clauses cut out, and an explanatory note added. The commissioners finally suggested that the rubric should be lengthened as follows : "The articles of the creed ought to be received and believed as being agreeable to Holy Scripture. And the Condemning clauses are to be understood as relating only to those who obstinately deny the substance of the Christian Faith." Archbishop Tillotson would have gone further. "I wish we were well rid

of it," he said. Convocation, however, had no mind for the business, and no change was made.

The eighteenth century was a day of Latitudinarian views, and of the decay of vigorous Church life; we are not surprised, therefore, to find that a creed distasteful to so many dropped very largely out of use, not without protest however, for that century gave the Church the most masterly defence yet made of the creed, from the pen of Waterland in answer to an attack of Dr. Samuel Clarke.

The nineteenth century witnessed a great revival in its use. The Tractarians of the early thirties onwards brought it back into the service of the Church, and urged obedience to the rubric, ordering its recital on the occasions named therein. This, however, led to a revival of conflict which has steadily gone on since.

In 1867 a Royal Commission on Ritual sat, and in its fourth report suggested the following note be appended to the rubric concerning the creed :—

"Note that the condemnations in this confession of Faith are to be no otherwise understood than as a solemn warning of peril of those who wilfully reject the Catholic Faith."

Many of the Commissioners felt this did not go far enough, and Archbishop Tait desired,

like his predecessor, Archbishop Tillotson, to exclude it from the Church services.

If the attacking party felt strongly so did the defenders of the creed. Bishop Thirlwall, and Dean Stanley were on one side, Drs. Pusey and Liddon on the other; and, so bitter was the spirit of the controversy, that it bid fair to make a breach in the Church.

In 1873 a Committee of Convocation took the matter up, and recommended the following declaration :—

"For the removal of doubts and to prevent disquietude in the use of the creed commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius, this Synod doth solemnly declare :—

(1) That the Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius, doth not make any addition to the Faith as contained in Holy Scripture, but warneth against errors which from time to time have arisen in the Church of Christ.

(2) That, as Holy Scripture, in divers places doth promise life to them that believe and declare condemnation to them that believe not, so doth the Church in this confession declare the necessity for those who would be in a state of salvation of holding fast the Catholic Faith, and the great peril of rejecting the same, wherefore the warnings in this confession of the Faith are to be understood no otherwise than the like warnings in Holy Scripture, for we must receive God's threatenings even as His promises, in suchwise as they are generally set forth in Holy Writ. Moreover, the

Church doth not herein pronounce judgment on any particular person or persons, God alone being the Judge of all."

This was clearly in the nature of an apology as well as a safeguard against misunderstanding.

This declaration was reaffirmed in 1879, but it did not touch the use of the creed in the service, or add to, or qualify the Prayer Book itself.

In 1888 a Committee of the Lambeth Conference on "Authoritative Standards" reported: "In like manner we accept the hymn 'Quicunque Vult,' whether or not recited in the public worship of our Churches as resting upon certain warrant of Scripture, and as most useful both at home and in our missions in ascertaining and defining the fundamental mysteries of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord, and thus guarding believers from lapsing into heresy." But the Committee add a little later:

"We are of opinion that as opportunity arises it would be well to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed and of the Quicunque Vult."

A resolution in accordance with the final commendation was adopted, but nothing seems to have resulted.

At the next conference in 1897 another resolution was passed, asking for the retransla-

tion of the creed, but omitting all mention of the Nicene. In the last Lambeth Conference, 1908, the whole question of Prayer Book revision was referred to a Committee, who, at the close of a most interesting report, allude to the Quicunque Vult as follows :—

"The Committee, having had under consideration the liturgical use of the Quicunque Vult, would point out the existing divergence and practice in the various Churches of the Anglican Communion, together with the resolution . . . of 1888, show that the use or disuse of this hymn cannot be made one of the terms of Communion."

The Committee determined to make no general recommendation as to the use or disuse of the creed in the Offices. Since then the Southern House of Convocation has adopted a resolution for the retention of the creed in the Prayer Book "without the existing rubric." [1]

[1] In discussing objections to the creed the Bishop of Gloucester remarks that such a suggestion, viz., that the rubric be removed, "does not raise so important a question of principle as the previous one (*i.e.*, the removal of the monitory clauses). It cannot be denied that it is within the competence of the Church so to act. Changes have been made on previous occasions in the rules governing the use of the creed, and, if necessary, they may be made again. It is a question of wisdom and advisability rather than of principle." ("The Three Creeds," page 256.)

VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CREEDS.

The teaching of the three creeds may be briefly summarised under :—

(1) The doctrine of the Nature of God.

(2) The doctrine of God's relations with the world and man.

The Athanasian Creed gives the fullest exposition of the doctrine of God (which occupies twenty-eight out of forty-three verses), and deals expressly with the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

The Nicene Creed contains the fullest statement of the doctrine of the Person of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.

The Apostles' Creed, keeping close to the baptismal formula, says :—

"I believe in God the Father Almighty.

And in Jesus Christ His Only Son.

And in the Holy Ghost"—without any statement of their Oneness or Equality.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

This is the first thought. "I believe in One God." The emphatic "One" of the Nicene Creed in contradistinction to the sim-

pler form of the Apostles' marks the existence of Gnostic teaching in the East in the second century, a system which interposed lesser divinities called Aeons between the Supreme and man.

Although almost a truism with us, yet the Unity of God still occupies a large place in the instruction of native races in the mission field. Our Lord emphatically reiterates it when He quotes from the Book of Deuteronomy: "*Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.*"

THE PERSONALITY OF GOD.

After the Unity follows the Personality. Pantheism taught that God had no separate Personality, but was the Spirit Who dwelt in all things. This was a half truth about Him and taken by itself a very dangerous half. It taught God's immanence without His transcendence. The one is the counterpart of the other, and both form part of the Christian Faith.

The first is clearly expressed by S. Paul in the words: "In Whom are all things and we in Him," and again: "In Him we live, and move and have our being."

Just as clearly does S. Paul assert God's transcendence: "Which in its own times He shall shew, Who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in

light unapproachable ; Whom no man hath seen nor can see" (1 Tim. vi. 15, 16, R.V.).

"The Immanence of God is part of the truth taught in Scripture, and abundantly acknowledged in Christian theology, though it is, perhaps, from its seemingly neuter or abstract character less easily apprehended by us and less welcome to many ; modern understanding of the vastness and ubiquity of order and modern analysis of the Divine methods have greatly increased our sense of its significance, and taught us to connect it with much that most commands our reverence. But it can never exclude or absorb that which is expressed by transcendence." (Lambeth Conference, 1908. Report on "Faith and Modern Thought.")

To overmagnify the Immanence of God in Nature comes perilously near the abolition of His Personality, and with that the responsibility of man to his Creator, since it would make God and Nature one.

THE TRINITY.

But if the Church believes God is One, she believes also that within the Divine Being there are Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that these words "Father," "Son," and "Holy Spirit" express a true and eternal relationship between the three.

The Father is the one and only source of Godhead, whilst the Son and Spirit receive their Godhead from Him—the Son begotten, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father.

"The Father is made of none: neither created nor begotten.

"The Son is of the Father alone: not made nor created, but begotten.

"The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding."

The distinction between the Persons was denied by the Monarchians, the Godhead of the Son by the Arians, the Godhead of the Spirit by the Macedonians.

The early Fathers had considerable difficulty in using terms which should distinguish between the nature of God which all Three possessed and the three Persons.

Two words, *ousia* and *hypostasis*, were used at first by the Greek Fathers to express the Divine Nature communicated by the Father to the Son and Holy Spirit, but gradually the second term, "*hypostasis*," came to be used only to express the distinction between the Persons.

Again, in the Latin Fathers, a similar difficulty was felt—the Latin words equivalent to the Greek terms were, for "*ousia*," *essentia*, for "*hypostasis*," *substantia*; but in the West both terms were employed to express the One Nature, and the distinction was expressed by the term *persona*. Thus they spoke of *una substantia* and *tres personae*. Yet the term *persona* was a weak one, it meant too little,

clearly resembling our word character, thus endangering the doctrine of the Trinity.

Passing into our language there is the same difficulty. Following the Latin we use the terms *substance* of the One Nature, and *person* of the distinction between the Three, yet our word *person* implies almost separate individuality, and would by itself destroy the Unity. So we protect the truth with the double phrase "One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

It will be noted that whereas in this matter the Apostles' Creed confines itself to the language of Scripture, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds do not; the words *substance* and *Trinity* are not found in Scripture, but are of very early use in stating the doctrine of the Godhead, both being found in the writings of Tertullian (A.D. 180-210). The need of a technical phraseology was felt by the Church as soon as men began to demand an explicit statement of the doctrine.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SON.

We have spoken at some length about the Divinity of our Lord when dealing with the modern objections to the Apostles' Creed, and with the history of the creed at the Council of Nicea. The Catholic Church believes that Jesus, born in time of Mary the Virgin, was from all eternity Son of God—eternally begotten of His Father—that in the fulness of time, He

came forth from the Father and through the operation of the Holy Spirit took a perfect human nature in the womb of the Virgin Mary "for us men and for our salvation." Thus in the one Person of Christ there are two whole and perfect natures, God and Man, in perfect union—neither detracting from nor destroying the other.

False teaching concerning the Person of Christ began very early amongst certain Jewish-Christian sects, and there are traces of it even within the New Testament, but the fourth and fifth centuries saw most of the chief heresies; pushing along some one line of thought too relentlessly each of the heresiarchs destroyed some other part of the truth. "Each sect appealed triumphantly to the logical irresistibleness to its development." "Be logical, said the Arian. "Jesus Christ is the Son of God; a son cannot be coeval with his father."

"Be logical," said the Apollinarian, "Jesus Christ was not two Persons; He was not, therefore, Perfect God and Perfect Man too." "Be logical," said the Nestorian, "Jesus Christ was Man and was God; He was, therefore, two Persons." "Be logical," said the Eutychian, "Jesus Christ was only One Person; He could, therefore, have only one Nature." To the intellectual imagination of the great heresiarchs of the early ages, the doctrine of our Lord's nature

took boldly some one line and developed continuously and straightforwardly some one idea; it demanded unity and consistency. . . . The Creed of the Church kept its middle course, rigidly combining opposites; and a mixed and balanced erection of dogmatic language arose." (Mozley "Theory of Development," pages 41-3.)

At the time of the Reformation many of the errors concerning our Lord which marked the early centuries revived under Anabaptism, notably the Docetic view that He had merely a phantom body, which has left its impress upon our own Articles (vide Arts. ii. and iv.). The Socinians also revived the Arian view, and became the forbears of the modern Unitarians.

At the present day the danger lies not in the outspoken denial of His Godhead by the Unitarians, but in the more subtle detracting from it by many Christian teachers who still profess to hold the Catholic Faith.

The entire efficacy of the redemptive work of Christ lies in the fact that He was at once God and man. As God, He, the Creator, can recreate in man His image; as man He could be man's free representative.

As God He could take our perfect human nature, and give to it that new force which it had not of itself, by which He could impart it with all its life-giving force to us through the great Sacraments of the Church.

Destroy this cardinal truth and He sinks into a great Teacher, only a man, and as incapable of touching and healing the sinner as any other of the great who are dead.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT.

We have seen that the enlargement of the Nicene Symbol was due to the errors of Macedonius, who denied the personality of the Holy Spirit, and that modern critics have contended that this doctrine is neither Apostolic nor was it held in the second century, and we have already examined the verity of their statement. It will suffice here to warn the reader against the common error, often heard, of speaking of the Holy Spirit as "It." So far from our idea of Spirit tending towards this view it rather necessitates personality. It is the spirit of man which could more truthfully be called the "person" of man rather than any other part of him.

We speak then of the Spirit as the Third Person of the ever-blessed Trinity proceeding from the Father and the Son, or, as the Greek Church has it, "through the Son." "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter"; or again, "The Comforter." . . Whom the Father will send in My name." And yet again, "When the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from

the Father, He shall testify of Me." It was such passages as these which suggested the term used in the creed, but there is a doubt whether all or any of them refer to the eternal relation subsisting between the Father and the Spirit, or merely to the Spirit's mission in the world. As to the real meaning of the term "proceeding" we may quote the cautious words of Dr. Gibson :—

"What the word ultimately denotes must ever remain a mystery in this life. But we cannot doubt that there is some real truth and an eternal fact in the Divine nature indicated by the way in which Holy Scripture, while speaking of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity as God's *Son* and *begotten*, never makes use of these terms when speaking of the Third Person in the Godhead. Consequently the Church, following the guidance of Holy Scripture, has never ventured to employ them. Some word, however, was required to express the Scriptural truth that the Spirit is not unoriginate, but issues forth from the Father. . . . The term which finally obtained widest acceptance and found a place in the creed was 'proceeding.'" ("The XXXIX. Articles," page 209.)

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD'S RELATION TO THE WORD.

We pass now to the second great truth contained in the creeds.

It falls naturally under three heads.

(1) The relation of the Father as Creator.

(2) The relation of the Son as Redeemer.

(3) The relation of the Holy Ghost as Sanctifier.

The Christian Faith believes that while the work of each can thus be separated all Three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity co-operate in their work for man.

(i) God the Creator.

"Maker of heaven and earth" (Apostles' Creed). "Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible" (Nicene).

Once more, the greater fulness of the Nicene Creed reminds us of the speculative system of the East, which separated the world from God.

Modern science has not overthrown the doctrine of the creation of the world by God; it has changed and enlarged our knowledge of the Divine method of work. A few years ago Materialism and the new doctrine of Evolution seemed as though they would seriously contest the truth as contained in the creed, but a wider knowledge "has as it were pierced through and behind matter, until that which seemed so solid and stable appears almost to vanish into some form of force of which we can hardly say that it is material at all, and which rather suggests what we only know in our own consciousness as life and will."[1] Thus the crude theories of early materialists have been checked and a new

[1] Lambeth Conference, 1908, Report p. 71.

era of scientific thought has come which seems so directly to connect what we call "spirit" with matter, as to indicate further and more complete light on God's creative energy.

Yet, though we speak of the Father as Creator, we believe also that both Son and Holy Spirit co-operate in that wonderful work.

So S. John speaks of that Eternal Word: "By Whom all things were made, and without Whom there was nothing made that was made."

Or again in the Hebrews: "By Whom also He made the worlds." So that the Son Who redeemed is the same Person Who created.

So, too, did the Spirit of God, the "Life-giver," co-operate when He brooded on the face of the waters (Gen. i. 2). And again in the Book of Job "By His Spirit He hath garnished the heavens" (xxvi. 13).

(ii) God the Redcemer.

"Now in truth this great work was peculiarly suited to God's goodness. For if a King, having founded a house and city, if it be beset by bandits from the carelessness of its inmates, does not by any means neglect it, but avenges and reclaims it as his own work, having regard not to the carelessness of its inhabitants, but to what beseems himself; much more did God the Word of the all-good Father not neglect the race of men, His work, going to corruption: but while He blotted out the death which had ensued by the offering of His own body, He corrected their neglect by His own

teaching, restoring all that was man's by His own power." (S. Anthanasius, "De Incar." Robinson's translation, Chap. x.)

Or once again :—

"For as, when the likeness painted on a panel has been effaced by stains from without, he whose likeness it is must needs come once more to enable the portrait to be renewed on the same wood: for, for the sake of his picture, even the mere wood on which it is painted is not thrown away, but the outline is renewed upon it; in the same way also the most holy Son of the Father, being the Image of the Father, came to our region to renew man once made in His likeness, and find him, as one lost, by the remission of sins; as He says Himself in the Gospels: 'I came to find and save the lost'" (ch. xiv.)

And "it belonged to none other to bring man back from the corruption which had begun than the Word of God, Who also had made them in the beginning."

METHOD OF REDEMPTION.

The method of the great work was the Incarnation—the Word taking our entire human nature. It may have been God's eternal purpose thus to unite man to Himself by an act of Incarnation, and it has been believed by many that the fall of man merely affected the conditions of the Incarnation. But we need not turn to speculation where we can bow in reverence before the historic act by which the dignity

of our human nature was vindicated by its Creator.

We have spoken elsewhere of the evidence for the Virgin Birth. It is a deep mystery, demanding the spirit of adoration more than inquiry, and whilst we adore the Son of God Incarnate, we honour her too, who was chosen by God for His human mother—Mary the Virgin, in whom all womanhood is honoured and dignified.

THE ATONEMENT.

All three creeds pass from the Incarnation to the suffering and death of Christ ; the Nicene and Athanasian giving the reason of the Passion. "For us," "For our salvation."

Like the Incarnation the great act of the Atonement demands the submission of reason to revelation ; faith rather than inquiry. Reason asks, how could the death of Christ be a propitiation for sin? Is it not an unjust conception to visit the sins of others even upon one willing to suffer?

Yet Christ Himself three times affirms the truth. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." "This is My body which is broken for you." "This is the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

The voluntary surrender then of Christ's

life in death possessed an infinite efficacy in the work of reconciliation.

Yet Holy Scripture always connects the death of Christ with His work as Risen Lord. "He died for our salvation, and was raised again for our justification," says S. Paul. And it is only when we consider the work of Christ as a whole that we get a true view of the Atonement. He, the Representative Man ("Son of Man," as He called Himself), gave up willingly His sinless life to vindicate the truth of His mission—the price exacted to complete His work—and bore for us His suffering and death, took again on the third day His risen body and passed as our representative into the presence of God—within the veil—to present there before His Father His own spotless and sinless Humanity now made perfect by death. The writer of the Hebrews uses the type of the high priest taking the life-blood of the goat, slain without the camp and passing with it within the veil into the presence of God to make the covering over of the sins of the Israelite. "Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. ix, 11, 12, R.V.), and again :—

"Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us" (ver. 24).

There are three words in Scripture which denote this act of Christ, all giving a different aspect of it—redemption, propitiation, reconciliation.

(1) It is called a *redemption*—here the figure is that of redeeming a slave from bondage, and especially of Israel from the Egyptian slavery. So Christ redeems us from the power of death and sin.

The idea is employed by S. John in his first epistle, S. Paul, and the author of the Hebrews.

(2) The passage in S. Paul contains both the idea of redemption from bondage and of *propitiation.*

"Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His blood, to shew His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season: that He might Himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 24-6, R.V.).

Whatever be the full meaning of this act of atonement we should notice that there is no idea of assuaging the wrath of an angry God—for it is God Who sets forth His own Son of

His infinite love before the eyes of all as a sacrifice.

(3) The third word is *Reconciliation*, used chiefly by S. Paul, as in the great passage. "But all things are of God, Who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 18, 19).

Here again we see the same idea of the Father out of His infinite love sending forth the Son to suffer, and this infinite love of the Father is the force which moves men to repentance (Rom. v. 8-10; 1 S. John iii. 1; iv. 9, 10).

Yet in all this there is no idea of *substitution.* Christ did not die instead of us; we shall all die, nor did He bear the exact punishment of sin due to us. Both the Scriptures and common experience show that the punishment of sin exists in this life as well as in the next. What He did bear was the *guilt* of sin—that dreadful shame and estrangement which the soul feels when it realises that sin has placed a barrier between us and our God. This He bore, and bore it vicariously, not for His own sins, but for ours, making Himself one with His brethren.

So in some mysterious way the forgiveness of sins is ours through His death.

But this forgiveness is not a thing apart from the redemption and deliverance from the power of sin—of the work of making us just, sometimes called sanctification. Christ's work cannot really be divided. Forgiveness and restoration go hand in hand. The Cross is efficacious, because the living Christ also saves now from sin, and restores us again to holiness. Through His death we may now be accounted righteous, because He is making and will make us righteous, and, therefore, children of God by inheritance and in character.

THE ASCENSION INTO HEAVEN AND HEAVENLY PRIESTHOOD.

We have already anticipated this part of Christ's work. We cannot separate the act of sacrifice from the presentation of that sacrifice in heaven itself. At the Ascension Christ entered as God-man upon the great work of His heavenly Priesthood and Kingship, which is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The Redeemer returns again to glory, and enters upon that endless reign expressed in the words of the creed: "Whose Kingdom shall have no end."

So He appears, in His twofold office of Priest-King to the Apostle in Patmos—this Ruler of the kings of the earth—clad in the garments of Priesthood, yet girded for serving (Rev. i. 13), and wielding the two-edged sword of power—the Lord of the Churches. In

close connection with the work of the Great High Priest in heaven is the service of His Priesthood on earth offering upon His altar the sacred offering of Himself, and perpetually doing in remembrance of Him, that which He Himself has bidden them; proclaiming "the Lord's death till He come." (See 1 Cor. xi. 23-26.)

THE SECOND COMING.

Much attention has been paid of late to the so-called eschatological (*i.e.*, those which deal with the last things) passages in the New Testament. The chief are S. Matt. xxiv. and xxv.; S. Mark xiii.; S. Luke xxi.; 1 Thess. iv. 13 to v. 11; 2 Thess. i.-ii.; and 1 Cor. xv. 23-8; and the visions in the Revelation.

The chief facts concerning it are these:—

(1) Our Lord most clearly taught His disciples to expect His return.

(2) They looked for Him as *coming speedily*, so much so that the Thessalonians even gave up working, imagining it to be almost upon them.

(3) That S. Matthew and S. Mark link it with the Fall of Jerusalem in giving our Lord's discourse upon it delivered in Holy Week (S. Luke seems to separate the two discourses). The chief difficulty then lies with the Apostolic misconception. How came they to conceive that the Lord was returning in glory so quickly? Was it a misconception of our Lord's teaching

or not? I believe it was a misconception. In the eschatological parables (the Virgins, the Talents, the Pounds) our Lord seems as clearly to put His coming a long way off as the Apostles make it almost immediate by joining it with the discourse on the Fall of Jerusalem; and He emphatically affirms it shall not be until the world is evangelised (S. Matt. xxiv. 14), and "the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (S. Luke xxi. 24), and standing as we do so far away from the beginnings of Christianity we can well understand why our Lord should have left the matter in uncertainty (compare Acts i. 7). Others have suggested that the Apostles did not misunderstand Jesus, but that He Himself thought of His return as almost immediate; others have thought the second coming partially fulfilled in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Yet the Scriptures clearly foretell a personal return of the Saviour, and for this the Church still waits and prays "Thy kingdom come."

THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

The early Christians regarded the bestowal of the Holy Spirit as the great gift of Christ to men; this is clearly shown in the incident at Ephesus on S. Paul's second visit there. It seems that Apollos in his early teaching in the city had taught "knowing only the baptism of John," and many received this preparatory

truth who had not learnt the fuller faith of Jesus. So when S. Paul came the second time he finds several of these half-instructed believers. "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?" They said unto him, "Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Ghost was given." And he said, "Into what then were ye baptized?" And they said, "Into John's baptism" (Acts xix. 2, 3).

Thus the bestowal of the Spirit was the great gift of membership, which forms the bond uniting men into the great society we call the Church.

The Spirit is frequently called the "Spirit of Christ"—a phrase which signifies the manner of the Spirit's coming and His work: He is the Spirit sent at the prayer of Christ. "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter;" and, further, He is the Spirit Who imparts Christ to men.

The work of the Spirit cannot be dissociated from the work of Jesus, nor from His Incarnate life. It is His office to make us partakers of the Incarnate life of Jesus, so that we become one in Christ and He in us—first through the waters of Baptism, then through the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. We still invoke the Spirit to sanctify the waters of Baptism, and the old prayer invoking the Spirit to come upon the elements at the Eucharist preserved and emphasised the same truth.

The Holy Spirit unites men through Baptism into the great Society of the Church, called by S. Paul the Body of Christ. This is why in the creeds the clause "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" follows immediately upon the clause "I believe in the Holy Ghost."

Further, the Spirit of Jesus is the guide of the believer's life. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God." He is perpetually with us, the Guide and Inspirer of act and thought, renewing the spirit of our minds into the likeness of the Master.

The Church is the sphere of the Spirit's action, not in the sense that the Spirit is limited to the Church, but that God has been pleased to guarantee us His gifts in a certain way and under certain conditions, so that we may be assured of receiving them.

The Church then is the whole company of the baptized—those who through the Spirit have been made members of Christ. The four words added to it in the Nicene Creed explain her origin, characteristics and office.

She is ONE.—There can be but one body of Christ. The present divisions of Christendom are in distinct violation of Christ's own prayer "That they may be one, even as We are one." And it is the bounden duty of every true Christian to work for the drawing together of all the baptized again into union with each other.

HOLY. — Because of the indwelling Spirit, and "because her members are set apart for God's service, 'a peculiar people.'" "Just as the Israelites claimed for themselves the title οἱ ἅγιοι (the holy ones) because God selected them from the other nations to lead a life acceptable to Him and rejoice in His favour and protection" (Dan. vii. 18), "so this appellation is very often in the New Testament transferred to Christians, as those whom God has selected out of the world" (John xvii. 14, 16), "that under the influence of the Holy Spirit they may be rendered, through holiness, partakers of salvation in the Kingdom of God." 1 S. Pet. ii. 9 (Grimm's "Lexicon").

CATHOLIC.—In its primary sense the word means universal, and depicts the world-wide mission of the Church; it also expresses her infinite adaptability through the gifts of the Spirit to meet the needs of all men. Herein lies one of the strongest proofs of her Divine origin. Through the everlasting Gospel she has found herself able to meet the needs of all nations—the Greek, the Roman, the Teuton, the Japanese, the Chinaman, the Red Indian, and the African.

APOSTOLIC. — The word marks the Church's origin, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles, Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone." It marks also the source of her teaching and ministry.

It was the chief boast of Iranæus that the Church of his day throughout the world had kept intact the teaching of Jesus, as handed on by the Apostles—this was the guarantee of her genuineness. So, too, he claims that the ministry also is Apostolic.

THE THREEFOLD MINISTRY.

The evidence for the threefold ministry must be put here briefly.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have quite clearly, the Apostles, the elders, and the seven (sometimes called deacons). S. Paul, in his farewell address at Ephesus, addresses the "elders" also as "bishops" or "overseers" of the Church.

In the Pauline Epistles we find the same distinction—he writes to the bishops and deacons at Philippi, and in the Pastoral Epistles he instructs Timothy and Titus how to deal with the "bishops" and "deacons."

In these later epistles we have another important fact—we find that Timothy and Titus are in charge of the Churches at Ephesus and Crete, put there by S. Paul himself (1 Tim. i. 3; Titus i. 5); with powers to ordain, to regulate the public services and to administer discipline (1 Tim. ii.-iii. v.; Titus i. 5-9, etc.). In fact, they have taken temporarily S. Paul's place. This enables us to understand two important things, first the relations of the Apostles to the

elders; and, secondly, how our present office of bishop came into being.

Although S. Peter calls himself a fellow-elder, and we find the elders acting in conjunction with the Apostles in the Council at Jerusalem, yet the Apostles held supreme control. S. Paul kept in his own hands as long as he could "the care of all the Churches" he had founded, acting with and through the co-operation of the elders (1 Cor. v. 3-5; 2 Cor. ii. 10).

When the time came that this was no longer possible S. Paul appointed others to take his place, Timothy at Ephesus, Titus at Crete. The successors of the Apostles carried on the Apostolic office, and became the link between the Apostolic government and what we call episcopal government. At what time the title "bishop" became distinct from the word "elder" and denoted the elder who had succeeded in a Church to the Apostolic place we cannot determine, but it was during the latter half of the first century, since Ignatius of Antioch in his epistles speaks time and again of the bishops, presbyters and deacons in a way to show that three orders were then universally recognised.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

The origin and meaning of this clause has been discussed elsewhere. It expresses the fellowship between the brethren in Christ.

It is based upon the doctrine of the Church as the "Body of Christ" set out fully by S. Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 12-27. Christ is the Head of the Body, we are the members; "for in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body."

First it is a fellowship of the baptized on earth, a fellowship implying mutual love, sympathy and aid, a fellowship as close as that of the limbs of the body. This fellowship has met with but imperfect recognition in the Church of later days. It is in practice the fulfilment of Christ's command "That ye love one another."

Further, it implies the oneness of those on earth with those departed in the true faith of Christ, a unity which justifies our prayers for the dead, and makes us feel that we are not alone in our conflict here with sin, but are surrounded by the great cloud of witnesses (Heb. xi. 40; xii. 1 and xii. 22-24).

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

The Nicene Creed connects forgiveness directly with Baptism. "One Baptism for the remission of sins," and it does this naturally since Baptism is the seal of our forgiveness and cleansing. It is the laver of regeneration, through which comes the forgiveness of sins already committed, and the assurance of pardon for the future (Titus iii. 5.) "Once for all then," says Augustine, "we are cleansed by Baptism, and daily we are cleansed by prayer."

The doctrine of forgiveness is in close con-

nection with the Communion of Saints. Just as the sickness of a limb affects the whole body, so does the sin of the individual affect the Body of Christ, although the effect may vary in intensity. Some sins cause an open scandal in the Church and dishonour both her Master and herself in the eyes of men; for such the Church has demanded public penance, and exercised her power of excommunication (1 Cor. v. 3-5). Other sins are more concealed, and often eat, like an inward cancerous growth, into the life of the Church, poisoning her vitality. No sin affects the sinner only; and for all who cannot quiet their own conscience the Church offers the ministry of absolution "that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness." (First exhortation in the Communion Office.)

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The doctrine of the bodily resurrection must be studied in the language of S. Paul (1 Cor. xv.). He carefully distinguishes between the corruptible part of man and the incorruptible, between the fleshy body and the "spiritual body," and insists as strongly upon the change from the earthy to the heavenly as he does upon the resurrection itself. He emphatically declares that flesh and blood cannot inherit the

Kingdom of God, and that as there is an earthy body so also will there be a heavenly.

The words in the various forms of creed differ considerably, some having "the resurrection of the *flesh*," some "the resurrection of the *body*"; but there is little difficulty here. We should not expect in the early ages of the Church the same precise distinction between the term "flesh" and "body" which we find today. "A more spiritual view of the nature of the resurrection body may be ours than was that of those who placed this article in the creed, as with the experience of the ages we have come to see deeper into the heart of the Scriptural truth, which they were endeavouring to safeguard and express." (Gibson, "The Three Creeds," page 105.)

THE LIFE EVERLASTING.

This is the final goal of the redeemed. It is all summed up in that one grand passage in S. Paul's letter to the Philippians iii. 8-14:—

"Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for Whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ, and be found in Him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: that I may know Him, and

the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead. Not that I have already obtained or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself yet to have apprehended: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

* * * * * *

"I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again and will receive you unto Myself, that where I am there ye may be also."

APPENDIX.

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE CREEDS OF THE EAST AND WEST.

The reader will have noticed that there are but two types of creeds in the Church (if we omit the *Fides Athanasii*), *viz.* : The *Old Roman type*, and the *Nicene* type ; and, further, that all the creeds of the *West* follow the first, and the creeds of the East the second.

Can we trace any relation between these two?

In the *Eastern Church* the *earliest* definite creed we have is the one presented by Eusebius of Cæsarea, in 325 to the Council of Nicea. If this is the actual baptismal creed of Cæsarea it would point to a fixed baptismal confession in that part of the Church before Nicea.

Grave doubt has been cast on this by the fact of its abrupt ending and the long statement which immediately followed it, and Professor Harnack holds it to have been a " symbol which Eusebius had constructed expressly for the existing situation, not, of course, *ab ovo*,

but according to formulas at Antioch, or, as the case may be, in the schools of Origen and Lucian." ("Apostles' Creed," page 41.)[1]

If we accept this conclusion we have no "ancient communal symbol" in the East before that of Nicea.

Harnack urges that this view is supported strongly by the very free treatment of creeds and symbols after Nicea in the East, and the quite extraordinary forms of some of them; the fact that almost all the creeds after Nicea are based on that type, and the uncertainty in the clauses following the third article, viz., "on the Holy Ghost."

This view would present a striking difference between the Churches of the East and West, viz., that, whereas in the *West* we have the Old Roman Creed from about A.D. 165 onwards—the common parent of all baptismal confessions—practically everywhere in use, in the *East* we have no evidence of a *baptismal confession* similar to the West at all until after Nicea.

Other scholars hold that this view is condemned by the extracts and allusions to a baptismal creed in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, the Clement of Alexandria, and con-

[1] Eusebius began with the words, "As we have received from the bishops who preceded us, and in our first catechisings, and when we received the Holy Laver, etc."

tend that we have in them actual quotations from baptismal creeds then in use.

Harnack draws a distinction between a "baptismal formula" and a "confessional formula." He thinks that as early as Justin Martyr there existed a confessional formula in the East, which he roughly reconstructs as follows :—

"The belief in one God Almighty, and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Who was made flesh for us (or for our salvation), and in one Holy Spirit, Who, through the prophets, heralded the economy, and the birth from the Virgin."

He further believes that "there did actually exist in the East (in Asia Minor, or, as the case may be, Asia Minor and Syria) as early as the beginning of the second century, *inter alia*, a Christological μάθημα (instruction) which is most intimately related to the second article of the Roman Creed, and which, as regards the formulas and details peculiar to it, made its way into the Eastern symbols of the fourth century."

In A.D. 348 (twenty-three years after Nicea) Cyril of Jerusalem delivered an exposition of the Creed of Jerusalem to the catechumens; this creed is nowhere set out by itself, but can be collected from the lectures; it ran as follows :—

We believe in one God the Father Almighty,

Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible,

And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, Who was begotten, Very God, of the Father before all worlds,

By Whom all things were made,

Who became incarnate,

And was made man

Of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost,

Who was crucified and was buried, and descended into hell,

Rose again the third day,

And ascended into the heavens,

And sat down on the right hand of the Father,

And shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead,

Of Whose Kingdom there shall be no end ;

And in one Holy Ghost, the Paraclete,

Who spake in the Prophets ;

And in one Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,

And in one Holy Catholic Church,

And in the resurrection of the flesh,

And in life eternal.

This creed was not used at Baptism ; a much shorter form was in use, which S. Cyril gives us. The candidate was asked to express his belief in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and replied :—

"I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in one Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins."

The fuller creed bears so close an affinity to the Roman Creed that some scholars have regarded it as directly derived from it; Harnack says of it:—"The relationship is so close that Cyril's symbol can only be the daughter or the sister of the Roman one."

Cyril himself speaks of this as "the Faith," and seems to regard it as a summary of doctrine. Dr. Burn thinks it is of independent origin.

Could the connection between this creed and the Old Roman Creed be proved it would form a connecting link between that and our own Nicene Creed. (See page 32.)

Had the Eastern symbols of later date any influence on the expansion of the Apostles' Creed?

In the expanded form of the Old Roman Creed there are many phrases which seem to be of Eastern origin, viz., "Creator of heaven and earth," "suffered," "died," "descended into hell," "eternal life," "catholic."

We have seen that most of those additions are found in the Creed of Niceta of Remesiana, in Dacia. Niceta was acquainted with the Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem (from which we have just taken the creed) and quotes him freely; thus there is a direct connection be-

tween the treatise of Niceta and the teaching of S. Cyril of Jerusalem. Further than this, in 398 and 402, Niceta visited Paulinus of Nola (Italy), a man in close touch with the Church life and thought of Gaul and Italy, and Paulinus alludes to Niceta in terms of admiration, for his learning and work. (See Burn, pages 252, 253.) Niceta's own work on the creed was one of six books of instruction for neophytes, and from this his creed is gathered. (See page 32.) It is possible, therefore, that we have here the channel through which the catechetical teaching of the East affected and enlarged the Apostles' Creed. We may also recall the fact that the Churches of the East from the day of Irenæus onwards were in close relations with the Churches of Southern Gaul.

A BRIEF GLOSSARY OF TERMS.

Those terms which are common to two or all three creeds are placed under the Apostles' Creed, and marked thus †.

THE APOSTLES' CREED.

† "I."—The Creed requires a *personal* confession. Many ancient creeds, however, began "we," especially the Eastern Creeds.

† "Believe in."—"To put one's whole trust in"; not mere intellectual assent, but the belief of the heart.

† "Father Almighty."—Some have wished to read "The Almighty Father" (Harnack).

† "Almighty."—*i.e.*, the Sovereign Power of the Creator over the world He has made. "The word expresses the idea of exercised dominion rather than abstract might."

† "Heaven and earth."—*i.e.*, the entire Universe. The N.T. has more often "Lord of heaven and earth" (S. Matt. xi. 25).

† "Jesus."—O.T., Joshua or Jesus (Heb. iv. 8),= Saviour (S. Matt. i. 21).

† "Christ."—"The Anointed One=Hebrew: Messiah. It is the official title of Jesus. The Old Roman Creed probably kept this idea by reading "Christ Jesus."

† "Only."—Latin *unicum*: Greek μονογενὴς (S. John i. 18; iii. 16). The word expresses the eternal relation of the Second Person to the Father; His eternal sonship.

† "Lord."—Greek κυριος=Hebrew *Jehovah*, the sacred name of God. "'The Lord,' was the title which the Jew was accustomed to use in order to avoid the necessity of pronouncing the unutterable name of the Divine Being when he read his ancient Scriptures. It was his ordinary equivalent for the word which we call "Jehovah," and which occurs nearly 7,000 times in the O.T. (Robinson, "Some Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed," p. 15.)

"Suffered under Pontius Pilate."—The clause indicates the historic date of our Lord's death. He held the governorship from A.D. 26-36.

† "Hell."—The grave or place of the departed. O.T., "Sheol." (See R.V., Acts ii. 27, quoted from Psalm xvi.), N.T., Hades.

"Third day."—Roman reckoning, which always counted any part of a day as a day. Our Lord was buried on Friday afternoon, and rose early on Sunday morning.

† "Sitteth."—The whole clause is metaphorical. It asserts the resumption of His Divine prerogatives by the Eternal Son, and now as God-Man.

"Quick."—*i.e.*, "Living."

† "Catholic." (See pp. 46, 97.)

† "Church."—Equivalent to the Greek *ecclesia*—the general assembly of the citizens—so the Church is the body of the baptized.

NICENE CREED.

"Of all things visible and invisible."—Due to the Gnostic view.

"Very God of Very God."—"True God of true God;" emphasising the reality of the Godhead of the Son.

"Before all worlds."—*i.e.*, from all eternity.

"Substance."—*i.e.*, essence. (See pp. 79, 80.)

"By Whom all things were made." (See John i. 3, 10; Heb. i. 2.)

"For us men, and for our salvation."—The Nicene alone has this phrase.

"According to the Scriptures."—So the Creed expresses its belief in the Messianic character of the O.T. prophecy. (See pp. 11, 14, 15.)

"Giver of life."—Better "Life-Giver" (John vi. 63; 2 Cor. iii. 6).

"Who spake by the prophets."—*i.e.*, "Through" the prophets—the prophets of the old dispensation (1 Kings xxii. 24).

ATHANASIAN CREED.

"Whosoever will."—Rather "willeth" or "wishes"; Gibson: "desires to be saved."

"To be saved."—Some would translate "to be in a state of salvation." (See Catechism).

"That he hold."—"Keep hold of" rather than "lay hold of" (Gibson).

"Do keep."—"Shall have kept" (Burn).

"Everlastingly."—*i.e.*, eternally.

"Confounding the Persons."—*i.e.*, confusing them as the Sabellians did, who said there was really only one Person exhibiting Himself to man under three characters.

"Dividing the substance."—This the Arians did when they said the Son was not of the same nature or essence as the Father.

"Person." (See pp. 79, 80.)

"Such as."—*i.e.*, Father, Son and Holy Spirit have one and the same nature or essence.

"Incomprehensible." — Latin *Immensus*=Infinite, like the words of the *Te Deum*, "The Father of an infinite majesty," so expressing the idea that God cannot be confined to any space.

"Verity."—Faith or teaching: "Christian Truth" (Burn).

"By Himself."—"Severally." (Harold Browne.)

"Made of none."—The Father was termed by the Greek Fathers "the Fount of the Godhead," from whom the Son and Spirit derived their Godhead.

"Begotten."—The Scriptural phrase used of Christ's relation to the Father. (See p. 80.)

"Proceeding." (See pp. 83, 84.)

"None is afore or after."—*i.e.*, in *time*. There was no time when there was not the Trinity in Unity—the Godhead from all eternity comprising Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Arius said of the Son, "There was a time when He was not."

"Greater or less."—*i.e.*, in power.

"He that will."—"Willeth."

"Must thus think."—"Let him thus think."

"Believe rightly."—Believe "faithfully."

"Is God and Man."—Insert "equally." Latin, *et Deus pariter et homo est* (Burn).

"God of the Substance."—Rather "He is God of the Substance."

"Perfect God and perfect man."—It should read, Perfect God; perfect man of a reasonable, etc.

"One, not by conversion."—One, however, not by conversion.

"That have done evil."—"Who indeed have done evil" (Burn).

"Believe faithfully."—*i.e.*, firmly.

DATE DUE

DEC 31 '97

HIGHSMITH #45230

Printed in USA

64417 238.1Q
K727
Knapp, Charles
AUTHOR
Three creeds of the church

238.1 Q
K727
0

64417

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00078938